National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

The Capitalization of Music in London, 1660-1800

by

Anthony A. Olmsted ©

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Department of Anthropology

Edmonton, Alberta
Fall 1993

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-88281-6

Canadä

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: Anthony A. Olmsted

TITLE OF THESIS: The Capitalization of Music in London, 1660-1800.

DEGREE: Master of Arts

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1993

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

Anthony Olmsted
229 - 10A Street N.W.
Calgary AB
T2N 1W7

Dated: 29 July 1993

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled **The Capitalization of Music in London, 1660-1800** submitted by **Anthony A. Olmsted** in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of **Master of Arts** in **Anthropology.**

Michael

Dr. Michael Asch

Regula B. Qureshi

Dr. Regula Qureshi

Jean DeBernardi

Dr. Jean DeBernardi

Dated: 29 July 1993

Abstract

The aim of this work is to address Marx's theoretical position on musical relations of production by examining the growth of public concerts. Generally, Marx states that artistic relations of production lie outside of capitalism because of the inseparability of capital and wage-labour from a single producer (musician). However, Marx does not investigate the wider relations of production under which the performance event is subsumed in early capitalism; that is, the process of capitalization. In these wider relations the musician does serve as a wage-labourer to larger capitalists, despite owning the means of production for the musical event. In the absence of these broader capitalist networks, the growth of public concerts would not have been possible.

Following an exposition of the materialist framework and commodity theory that is used throughout, the data from London between 1660 and 1800 is presented. A historical context is built to illustrate the growth of capitalist relations of productions in the concert world. Several aspects of public concerts are examined including: early theatres, public houses, concerts clubs and halls, and pleasure gardens. In addition, the creation and protection of printed music is examined including a detailed discussion of copyright and patent protection.

After analysis of the data, the conclusion is that Marx's position on artistic relations of production must continue to be evaluated before it can accepted as Marx presented it. The particular historical example presented here suggests that Marx's position on the arts is incomplete. However, there may be other clues elsewhere in Marx's work. It is apparent, however, that the importance of labour to the construction of artistic value may prove central to further work in this area.

Acknowledgements

To my supervisors, Dr. Michael Asch and Dr. Regula Qureshi, I would like to offer my deepest appreciation and gratitude. I am very fortunate to have had the benefit of their experience and their intellectual and material generosity. I have learned lessons that will last a lifetime.

I would not be writing this were it not for the total and unflagging encouragement of my parents, Dr. Allan Olmsted and Noreen Olmsted. Their support is integral to my work and my life. There are no words to truly express my appreciation to them. To my brother, Pat Olmsted, goes the credit for showing me how important music can be, especially when its fun. Thanks.

Finally, to all the people who have played a part in my life over the years, there is a little of everyone in this work. However, some have had a direct and significant influence on this thesis and my life. To those people - I couldn't have done it without you.

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

Chapter 1: Theory 6
- 1.1 The Materialist Conception of History 6
- 1.2 Commodities 8

Chapter 2: Context 13
- 2.1 Class 14
- 2.2 Consumption and Leisure 17
    - 2.2.1 Consumption Models 20
- 2.3 London 23
- 2.4 Political Representation 25
- 2.5 Education 27

Chapter 3: Data 30
- 3.1 Public Concerts 30
    - 3.1.1 Early Theatres 31
    - 3.1.2 Music at Public Houses 35
    - 3.1.3 Concert Clubs 40
    - 3.1.4 Concert Halls 42
    - 3.1.5 Pleasure Gardens 44
    - 3.1.6 Concert Organizations 45
- 3.2 Music Printing and Publishing 49
    - 3.2.1 Music Printing and Publishing to 1700 49
    - 3.2.2 Music Printing and Publishing after 1700 51
- 3.3 Protection of Works - Patents and Copyright 54
    - 3.3.1 Early Protection of Printed Works 55
    - 3.3.2 Copyright Act of 1710 58
    - 3.3.3 Music Patents 61
    - 3.3.4 Music Dissemination 64

Chapter 4: Analysis 67
- 4.1 Performance Culture 67
- 4.2 Print Culture 73
- 4.3 Value 76
- 4.4 Response to Marx 79
- 4.5 Music as Commodity 81

Chapter 5: Conclusion 85

References Cited 92

Appendix 1: Composer privileges granted 1710-1770 104
Appendix 2: Principal publishers active in England (1560-1610) and Britain (1746-1800) 105
Appendix 3: An illustrative list of editions with known prices 106

List of Tables

Table 1: Periods of activity of public theatres in London, 1575-1642 31

Table 2: Periods of activity of private theatres in London, 1575-1642 32

Table 3: London public-houses where music is known to have been performed, 1648-1800 37

Table 4: Music rooms and music clubs known to be active, 1672-1781 41

Table 5: Pleasure gardens in and near London known to have had music, from 1659 45

Table 6: Number of music titles entered in Stationers' Company registers 63

Introduction

There are many reasons to investigate London's musical life between the Restoration and the end of the eighteenth century. Fundamental to the work as a whole is a general interest in London at this time. This interest, combined with other work on Marxian relations of production and commodification of contemporary music (Olmsted 1993), led to a more pointed inquiry into the early capitalist influence on musical production. Upon closer examination it became apparent that Marx had very little to say specifically about music. The little he did say was not at all encouraging.

Marx began by stating that the nature of artistic relations places the artistic product, and the relations in which they were formed, outside of capitalist production. He further characterized the artistic products as taking one of two forms. In the first instance Marx suggests that products, "such as books, paintings, in a word, all artistic products which are distinct from the artistic performance of the artist performing them" are considered 'immaterial' or 'non-material' items (Marx 1947:397). The second form of 'non-material' production is that in which "the production cannot be separated from the act of producing, as is the case with all performing artists..." (p. 398). Furthermore, only relations of production that place the artist as a wage-labourer separate from capital can be classified as capitalist relations, and are thus "applicable only to a very restricted extent" (p. 397). The vast remainder of the relations that characterize artistic production have "nothing to do with the capitalist mode of production proper and even formally [have] not yet been brought under its sway" (p. 398).

Given the definition of a commodity within capital (discussed in the next chapter), it appears incongruous that Marx could consider both types of artistic production to be 'non-material' and outside of capitalist relations of production. Marx concludes by dismissing the few remaining capitalist relations in the arts as being "so insignificant compared with the totality of production that they can be left entirely out of account" (p.398). I, however, disagree.

The motivation behind this work thus lies in a closer investigation of Marx's comments to attempt to establish their validity with respect to the productive relations surrounding the performance and printing of music. It must be made clear at the outset that 'music' as it is referred to throughout is not specifically and exclusively the sound object. It refers to the whole process of the production and consumption of a particular category of sound objects (in this case, primarily instrumental music), and at a broader level, the impact of the socioeconomic conditions of London in the post-Restoration period.

Furthermore, though there is a temptation to use the terms popular music and art music, they have been studiously avoided. Not only are such terms ambiguous and often contradictory at best, but it is increasingly doubtful whether such terms are even applicable in this historical period (See Zelechow 1991 or Booth & Kuhn 1990 for examples of this debate). It is important to note that much of the music in the concert halls was heavily influenced by the aristocracy, either from initial popularity in the opera or private concerts in England, or from the Continent (Westrup 1941; Izon 1958). Therefore, the new appreciation for the value of music by the middle and upper classes was less the adoption of a new musical style, than the reconsideration and redefinition of the intent and value of existing forms.

In the process of this investigation, a subordinate project will also be undertaken. Implicit within Marx's comments above is the suggestion that the products of artistic production also lie outside of the capitalist mode of production. That being so, the inference is that the products would then not be commodities as they are defined *within* capitalism. Further examination of music as a commodity will hopefully shed some understanding on this apparent contradiction.

A comment needs to be made on the use of 'music' throughout this work. Western musicology, and Western culture generally, has tended to attach particular importance to composers and their masterworks as signposts in musical and social histories (see for example Grout & Palisca 1988). However, efforts to actually define music have continued to be probematic (for example Nettl 1983). To avoid the difficulties of a separate definition, I have used the accepted musicological definition, but have deliberately avoided reference to composers and pieces. Using music in this more abstract way allows the issues in this work to be addressed at a theoretical level, while still being applicable to specific composers and their work.

Music will thus encompass a wide variety of forms ranging from an individual piece of music, to the music of an era or historical period, to written scores that are bought, sold, or performed. Only a few specific examples are referred to within the text . This is done only to highlight general characters as they relate to the broader social context.

London was chosen as the data base for a variety of reasons. As a case study, a large body of available data was a strong incentive to pursue this area compared to Paris or Vienna, for example. Examination of this data also indicates that London was likely the first city to support a regular public performance of instrumental and vocal concerts. Supported by a quickly developing capitalist mode of production, a strong middle class, and development of a publishing industry, London offers a perfect test case for examining the growth of the productive relations of music. The existence of essentially two types of music media, live performance and printed score, further simplifies the analysis.

The emphasis on instrumental and vocal music over the developing English opera of the time is deliberate and necessary. Superficially, the existence of a dramatic vocal element in first the English masque and later English opera would be enough to exclude opera from comment. However, the differentiation is much more subtle than it first appears. Arguments about the primacy of music over text might solve the dilemma, but such arguments have continued from the Florentine Camerata to the present day with no resolution (Lindenberger 1984). Furthermore, efforts to separate vocal music from its instrumental counterpart would be inappropriate for the data of this time period.

It seems contradictory to include vocal performance in the definition of instrumental music. However, the historical importance of vocal genres to the development of instrumental music cannot be overlooked. Sacred forms that have been adapted for concert performance, particularly oratorios, need to be included to accurately reflect the constitution of the early public concerts. Indeed, for all practical purposes, the voice can be treated as an instrument in considering early concerts. Nonetheless, that still leaves the difficulty in differentiating opera from other musical concerts.

Besides important physical parameters, discussed below, the masque and opera are distinguished by the existence of a strong dramatic element that includes the use of costumes and scenery for dramatic effect (Price 1989; Grout 1988). For example, the performance of William D'Avenant's *The Siege of Rhodes* in 1656, commonly regarded as the first English opera, had to disguise itself from Puritan censure. To do so, "the acts were called 'entries' and the whole spectacle was known not as an opera...but as 'A Representation by the art of Prospective in Scenes and the Story sung in Recitative Musick'" (Grout 1988:155).

A second important difference, related to the visual element of opera, is the theatre construction. One of the primary indicators used for the rise of public consumption of music is the growth of venues specifically designed for instrumental performance. These theatres have very different technical features in comparison to opera theatres. Behind the stage opera theatres must be designed to suspend and manipulate large scenery and special effects, none of which concern instrumental concerts. Indeed, instrumental concerts have on occasion taken place in opera theatres (when they were available) but the reverse is very rarely possible (notwithstanding highly reduced versions of opera).

In front of the stage, the theatres must also serve very different needs. The focus in operatic works is clearly the voice. Opera theatres had many tiers of boxes with a relatively short audience/performer distance. Combined with the very large, many layered fashions favoured by men and women at the time, conditions were created that absorbed low brass and strings and did not allow much reverberation in the theatre. As a result voices were clearer and not overpowered by the orchestra (Forsyth 1985).

The demands of instrumental music were less discriminating when it came to performance environments. Nonetheless, there are certain characteristics of instrumental music that need to be accommodated for optimal sound production. Longer, boxier halls satisfy the demands of instrumental music much better than opera theatres. The acoustic properties of these halls give the music longer reverberation times, adding to the apparent size and depth, balance and fullness of the sound. This is particularly important for correct representation of the lower frequencies in the orchestra.

As a result of these differing characteristics, and the subsequent cost differential between the two forms, opera and instrumental music rarely overlapped. It is clear there are important similarities between instrumental and vocal music and opera - these will be noted throughout this work. However, the differences in the historic development of the genre and the dramatic and visual elements of opera disqualify it from full inclusion into this analysis.

Now a few words about organization. The body of the work is divided into four chapters: theory, context, data, and analysis. Where qualifications are needed, they are provided in the text. However, some prefatory comments about each section may prove useful in understanding the underlying plan of the work.

The theory chapter is divided into two parts. The first part summarizes the founding assumptions and premises of Marx's materialist conception of history. This model will provide the 'guiding thread' that will hold the whole of the body of the work together. The second part comprises a contrast to the first. It is a much more detailed discussion of commodities and their defining characters under capitalism. By presenting both the general materialist framework and the specific characteristics of commodities, most of the features of capitalist production can be identified.

The final three chapters constitute something of a compromise. The context and data chapters contain as much of the pertinent 'objective' information as possible. The contextual portion attempts to give a broad demographic, economic and political background to London during this period. An effort was made, albeit in sweeping strokes, to illustrate the growth of economic classes that could potentially participate in the consumption of music, as well as the material conditions and possible motives for participating in consumption.

The main body of the data is in two parts: the first on public performance and the second on the printing and publishing of music. An attempt was made to cover these areas as completely as possible. However, as a result of the breadth of information and the necessity of relying on second hand sources (and the associated problems) some pitfalls are inevitable. Where there is confusion or weak spots in the data they are noted. However, this work is not intended as a complete historical account of music in London. It is presented as a case study by which to evaluate broader theoretical statements regarding music.

The analysis will focus on the type and form of the relationships that constitute musical production within capitalism, particularly the process of capitalization to which musical productive relations have been subject. Further discussion of the nature of the type and value of music as a commodity is also undertaken. By necessity, some additional data will be presented in conjunction with the data given in the previous section. The intention is to make the distinction between data as 'fact' and the data that is necessarily interpreted in line with the model. It will also, hopefully, avoid unnecessary repetition of information between the two sections.

Chapter 1
Theory

Marx (in Sayer 1987:40) asserted, "I do not start from 'concepts'...What I start from is the simplest social form in which the labour product is represented in contemporary society, and this is *the commodity*." Disobeying Marx for a moment, this section will start from concepts, albeit his own. The following section comprises the basic theoretical stance of this work. The first part addresses the assumptions and method of the materialist conception of history. As a historically grounded empirical method, there are only a few very important things that need to be said about it.

The section concludes with a discussion of commodities and their definition. The discussion of commodities is quite specific and detailed as a summary of Marx's work. The importance of commodities in a capitalist mode of production is evident from the above quote. The discussion thus provides a groundwork from which to evaluate some of Marx's comments on music and their position in the developing capitalist center of London.

1.1 The Materialist Conception of History

Much has already been written on the development and articulation of Marx's materialist conception of history (see Sayer 1987; Larrain 1986; McLennan 1981, 1983; Anderson 1976, 1983, for a representative sample). Therefore, there is little to be gained from further summation. However, the task at hand is perhaps even more particular - to present a meaningful interpretation of Marx's model without bastardizing his work or prejudicing the analysis that follows. With this in mind, historical materialism in this work is presented as Marx and Engels intended it, as an explanatory model, a method. It does not subscribe to the more 'orthodox' interpretations that tend toward varying degrees of determinism (see especially Cohen 1978, 1983; Shaw 1978).

The basis of the materialist conception of history is the premise that humans must exist and survive in the physical, material world before they can 'make history'. This suggests that the method of historical investigation place an emphasis on the development of a society's material means of survival. Understanding the material and social relations essential to production will then lead to the elucidation of the political, legal, and subsequently ideological precepts that order those relations. As Marx and Engels (1947:13-15) state:

> The fact is...definite individuals who are productively active in a definite way enter into these definite social and political relations. Empirical observation must in each separate instance bring out empirically, and without any mystification and speculation, the connection of the social and political structure with production....[I]t is the real living individuals themselves, as they are in actual life...

The net result of any particular ordering of productive relations then defines the mode of production for that society. Stated differently, the relations of production are all and only those relations that make up the mode of production particular to that society (Sayer 1987:75). Such relations can be conceptually separated further into material relations and social relations. Though both are inseparable in reality, in constituting the mode of production the material component of production is often separated and given primacy over the social relations (Cohen 1983, for example).

To clarify the position of ideology in the materialist method, Marx's underlying assumptions about consciousness need to be elaborated. Throughout his work, Marx stands in opposition to Hegelian idealism. Marx held that the material world constituted the basis of human consciousness, not the reverse. Contrary to first appearances, this conception does not deny the existence of human agency, of 'participatory' consciousness, that Marx deems necessary for social development. From the 'Theses of Feuerbach' Marx (1959:243-244) draws out two critiques of traditional materialist thought:

> [From Thesis I] The chief defect of all hitherto existing materialism...is that the thing, reality, sensuousness, is conceived only in the form of the *object* or of *contemplation*, but not as *human sensuous activity*, practice, not subjectively.

> [From Thesis III] The materialist doctrine that men are products of circumstances and upbringing, and that, therefore, changed men are products of other circumstances and changed upbringing, forgets that it is men that change circumstances...

Larrain (1986:17) offers the comment that,

> This suggests that consciousness is not only an expression but also a constitutive element of reality in so far as their reality is not already given but constructed by human practice. And human practice is characterized not only by being conscious but also by the fact that...it has a goal that can be anticipated.

It can now easily be seen why Marx would reject an idealist notion of ideology. To reject the concept of the ideal as a separable and determining entity logically denies these characteristics to consciousness and ideology. Ideology, therefore, cannot have an independent existence apart from the material relations, or mode of production of social life. Engels declared (Marx & Engels 1978:66) that it would be ridiculous to suppose that "because we deny an independent historical development to the various ideological spheres which play a part in history we also deny them any *effect upon history*." Thus ideology must be conceived as 'organically related' to the productive activities of a historical epoch, not as passively determined by them, or as autonomous and determinate upon them.

As a closing point, some comments need to be made regarding class. Firstly, Marx himself never defined class specifically for just the reasons elaborated. To do so would only be valid for the specific historical moment that is manifest in the definition and no further (Sayer 1987:31). Thus, Marx let the empirical conditions of the time under consideration suggest a workable definition. Such is the approach taken in this work.

Class tension appears ubiquitous within capitalist relations. Capital, because of its organization of production relations, demands the existence of dominant groups of owners of capital who possess power over subordinated groups who do not own capital. The inequity of the relations tends to produce class conflict (see throughout Marx's works, for example). However, in conceptualizing the form and resolution of such tensions I dissent slightly from Marx in favour of the formulation of hegemony offered by Gramsci (1990). Gramsci's notion of hegemony puts forth a much more active role for ideology in the reinterpretation of material relations by the dominant class to diffuse tension and maintain power[1].

On a cautionary note, such a broad formulation as provided here will clearly be suggestive of elements not applicable to the analysis of this data. The nature of the data, focussing on the productive relations of a very particular sort, does not include the larger issues of material and social reproduction of the mode of production as a whole. Assumptions must be made to compensate for the specificity of the data. However, to present a less complete version of the model is to be unfair to the integrity of the model itself.

1.2 Commodities

A commodity as it exists in a capitalist mode of production is characterized by two general features. The first is the exhibition of value by an object; that is, the object must be treated socially as having value. The second, following from the condition of value, is the appearance that the value displayed by the commodity is an inherent property of the object - that the object has been fetishized. The following sections will elucidate these characters and attempt to show the importance of the characters to further analysis.

The consideration of commodity value is central to its definition. The value component of a commodity can be split into two types: use-value and exchange-value. To be properly considered a commodity, an object must exhibit these two characteristics. Importantly, the construction of these value categories is possible only within the social organization of production that exists in a capitalist mode of production.

---

[1] This was never articulated as fully by Marx, though it appears to be consistent with his view of bourgeois/proletariat relations.

Consider first the use-value. Marx identified use-value as the usefulness, or the utility of the object at hand. However, it is not enough for an object to simply be useful. An object must be useful for other people, and it must have become useful through the intervention of human labour. Two conclusions follow from these conditions. Firstly, as the physical properties of the object constitute the range of its potential social utility, it stands to reason that use-values cannot exist outside the physical properties of that object. Secondly, if the only utility important to a commodity is social utility, then only through consumption or use of the commodity by others will such utility become manifest. Marx (1938:2-3) follows this by noting that the physical objects that constitute use-values "also constitute the substance of all wealth, whatever may be the social form of that wealth." Thus use-values form the material basis on which social value is constructed.

Complementing social utility, in fact following directly from its construction, is exchange-value. It is the exchange-value which gives material expression to the social character of the use-value as use-values interact in the marketplace. In other words, use-values are only material objects; their material properties make them socially desirable. The degree of social desire can only be expressed by placing the object in relation to a different object; that is, comparing the social value to other objects.

As mentioned above, one of the necessary characters of use-value is that it must be social; that is, the object must be demonstrably useful to someone other than the producer. The social utility is measured in concrete terms through exchange-value (or simply, value). However, the value of an object can never be demonstrated in relation to itself, it must be equated to the value of a different object - for example, expressing object A in relation to object B. To place two objects in such a relation splits the manner in which exchange-value is expressed into two types: relative and equivalent. Marx (1938:16) summarized this value relation as "two intimately connected, mutually dependent and inseparable elements of the expression of value; but, at the same time, are mutually exclusive, antagonistic extremes - i.e. poles of the same expression."

Relative value is the expression of exchange-value of one commodity in proportion to the use-value of another commodity. The relative value of commodity A can only be expressed in terms of the physical quantity of commodity B. Thus commodity A converts the use-value of commodity B into A's value expression; A's value is *relative* to B's use-value. Central to the relative value equation is that "real changes in the magnitude of value are neither unequivocally nor exhaustively reflected in their relative expression" (Marx 1938:23). Thus, the warning not to conflate relative value and value is clear. To do so would confuse the elements of relative and equivalent value, and consequently mislead the analysis of the historically specific conditions of commodity formation.

Before continuing with the discussion of equivalent value, a note on the relation of labour to value[2]. As mentioned above, only material transformed in some way by human labour, what Marx terms specific human labour, can exhibit the characteristic of social utility as part of a commodity. However, in the process of exchanging two use-values, the amounts of specific human labour as identifiable entities becomes lost. Labour is transformed from having a particular quality to only being identifiable as quantity. Therefore, some other unit of equivalence must be found on which a common level of exchange can occur.

Given that every commodity has specific human labour as a constitutive element and that the labour is expressed as a quantity, then, according to Marx, the sum total of all labour represents the abstract social labour of society. Thus each commodity shares this common feature of having some amount of abstract human labour. Therefore, when specific human labour is expressed as exchange value, it is being expressed as a particular manifestation of abstract human labour through which all commodities can become equivalents (Marx 1938).

To continue with the discussion of equivalent value, it is perhaps best to clarify a statement made above. Commodities cannot express their own value because

> no commodity can stand in the relation of equivalent to itself, and thus turn its own bodily shape into the expression of its own value, [therefore] every commodity is compelled to choose some other commodity for its equivalent, and to accept the use-value, that is to say, the bodily shape of that other commodity as the form of its own value. (Marx 1938:25)

The corollary to this statement is that when commodity B is expressed as an equivalent to commodity A, B is not able to quantitatively express its own value. B's apparent value is only a reflection of the value of A onto B's material form; it is not an expression of any value in B.

Marx (1938:25, 27) has identified two 'peculiarities' of equivalent value. Both have already been alluded to, but they are worth summarizing for clarity. The first is that "use-value becomes the form of manifestation, the phenomenal form of its opposite, [exchange] value." The second is "that concrete labour becomes the form under which its opposite, abstract human labour, manifests itself." Put another way, the concrete form of commodity B becomes the physical manifestation of the abstract labour embodied in commodity A.

---

[2] For Marx, labour is the cornerstone of his theory of value, and thus is essential to understainding the construction of commodity value. However, the discussion of labour in Marx's works is of great complexity, thus only the most important aspects are presented here.

The development of the relative/equivalent value forms can be represented in three equations: 1) A relative to B (reversible: B relative to A); 2) A relative to many commodities (non-reversible); and 3) Many commodities relative to C. It is the final equation that allows the flaws in the expanded commodity/commodity value relation to be overcome by separating the shifting nature of the relative/equivalent forms:

> the form C gives to the world of commodities a general social relative form of value, because...all commodities, with the exception of one, are excluded from the equivalent form. A single commodity ...appears therefore to have acquired the character of direct exchangeability with every other commodity because...this character is denied to every other commodity. The commodity that figures as universal equivalent, is, on the other hand, excluded from the relative form of value. (Marx 1938:38-39)

This 'universal equivalent' is the commodity expressed as money. The absence of a relative value form also indicates that such a commodity has been denied value in and of itself. It only has value based on its social utility as a universal unit of expression of the value of all other commodities.

The discussion of exchange value to this point leads to one of the most important of Marx's conceptual tools, that of fetishism[3]. It is a slippery category to grasp and equally difficult to try to practically demonstrate. Nonetheless, it helps to explain many of the social relationships that surround commodities.

Concrete labour exists in so far as it is the expression of a small portion of the sum total of the abstract human labour of the society; the totality of the social form of labour. Such concrete labour can create use-values that, though not commodities, can serve to provide sustenance to perpetuate the life of the producer. However, the production and reproduction of life in a capitalist society demands that social relations be entered into in order to support the production and reproduction of society. That commodities can only exist in the stated form in a bourgeois society is a result of the social organization that has developed in order to maintain a productive society.

Concrete labour then stands in relation to a variety of concrete forms (use-values) representing other amounts of concrete labour. Objects begin to stand in relation to each other in the social field of exchange as representatives of varying amounts of individual labour. The objects then come to stand in relation to each other, and in opposition to each producer, as individual material repositories of an expressed relative value. The value contained within each commodity as the amount of labour does not change. The appearance of value in the marketplace is the expression of the relative value of the amount of abstract labour embodied in the commodity, as it has been established through the relations between the commodities themselves[4].

---

[3] A good example of the cultural manifestation of commodity fetishism can be found in Taussig (1980).

These exchange relations constitute the apparently objective establishment of the value of labour in the commodity. To producers who have been separated from the interaction of the commodities by the exchange relationships, the value represented by the commodity and its physical form come to be equated. Thus the commodity itself appears to have an intrinsic value. The social construction of this value has been 'hidden' from view by the illusory abstraction of the value (exchange) relations themselves. The realm of exchange then perpetuates and reinforces the social perception of value: "The character of having value, when once impressed upon products, obtains fixity only by reason of their acting and reacting upon each other as quantities of value" (Marx 1938:46).

The fetish of the commodity has then become complete, with commodities appearing socially to have intrinsic and somewhat autonomous characteristics of value. In commodities, said Marx (1938:43),

> the social character of men's labour appears to them as an objective character stamped upon the product of that labour; because the relation of the producers to the sum total of their own labour is presented to them as a social relation, existing not between themselves, but between the products of their labour.

The establishment of capitalist productive relations culminates with an alteration of the producer's conception of the product:

> [The] division of a product into a useful thing and a value becomes practically important, only when exchange has acquired such an extension that useful articles are produced for the purpose of being exchanged, and their character as values has therefore to be taken into account, beforehand, during production. (Marx 1938:44)

---

[4] Marx states (1938:46): "The determination of the magnitude of value by labour-time is therefore a secret, hidden under the apparent fluctuations in the relative values of commodities."

Chapter 2
Context

There is always the danger of confusion when very specific data is used to argue a far more general theoretical point. Such is the danger here. In presenting the scope of the materialist notion of history, there is a tendency to prejudice the reader into expecting a very broad discussion and analysis of the topic. What is being proposed here is somewhat different. The intent is to test the validity of a position taken by Marx. In this regard the mandate of this project is very specific. To present such an investigation in its proper context widens the foundation to almost unmanagable proportions in order to make an otherwise simple argument.

The wider theoretical context of this work is necessary to provide the foundation for a solid analysis. However, the relationship between the data and the broader theoretical foundation needs to be clarified. The data in this case is presented to illustrate the process and effects of the capitalization of a single cultural industry. I do not believe that restricting the data to either a single example of productive relations (to create music), or to an artistic product, denies its applicability to wider processes within early capitalism. In fact music, in this case, may be able to elucidate more clearly the effects of the capitalist subsumption of an existing productive/consumptive relationship.

There are many broader issues that are excluded, but not ignored, by this discussion. The growth of the capitalist mode of production in London occurred comparatively quickly. However, there is absolutely no reason to suggest that the production of cultural products are exempt from the reorganization and re-establishment of the extensive networks of the new economic order. In fact, it is possible that cultural products have been absorbed more quickly into the capitalist networks that other types of production.

The next two chapters will present the details of the context and particular characteristics of musical performance and music printing and publication in early London. The following chapter on context is, as stated above, necessary to establish a groundwork from which an understanding of the networks supporting music production can be understood.

An important part of understanding music in London immediately after the Restoration (1660) relies on the overall demographic composition of the City. The following sections will give a broad outline of the primary features to illustrate the social, economic and political facets of urban life. These sections are not intended to be complete - each section could overcome this work on its own. The intention is to provide a balanced and relatively objective representation of the conditions of life in London. It is nonetheless directed at the middle and upper classes and towards understanding work and leisure in those classes. To do so requires at least a working definition of the differentiation of the classes, and then a discussion of London in general.

2.1 Class

This section must begin on a cautionary note. The mention of class in a Marxian framework presupposes some degree of class analysis. The complexity of this task evident simply from the elements of class that need to be identified. As E.P. Thompson (in Sayer 1987:146) states,

> Class is a social and cultural formation (often finding institutional expression) which cannot be defined abstractly, or in isolation, but only in terms of relationship with other classes; and, ultimately, the definition can only be made in the medium of *time* - that is, action and reaction, change and conflict...

To adequately identify and characterize class in this way would not only overwhelm this work, but would go far beyond any useful purpose in this investigation.

In contrast, class will be used in a descriptive, non-Marxian sense. Admittedly, using the term 'class' may prove problematic, but it serves well to denote a sociologically determined socioeconomic status. The data presented below is intended only to illustrate the range of socioeconomic statuses available at that time. Beyond some simple comparisons, this data is only part of the broad description of social life. For this reason a Marxian class analysis was bypassed in favour of the straightforward characterizations of descriptive sociology.

The numbers of classes in various frameworks range through one[5] (Laslett, in Neale, 1981:71), three (Rose, 1981:256), five (Neale, 1981:133; Nelson [1763] in Leppert, 1988:25-6) and seven (Defoe [1709] and Massie [1756] in Corfield, 1987). The model that seems to have the best balance between number of categories and analytical usefulness in this case is Neale's five-class model.

To identify these classes, Neale uses a combination of objective and subjective criteria: "I deliberately conflate objective and subjective criteria but, like Marx, I give greater weight to subjective criteria (the relative autonomy of class consciousness)." Neale (1981:133) identifies the primary characters of the classes as follows:

---

[5] Laslett claims that "there was only one class, the ruling landowning class, in pre-industrial England. All other groups were simply status groups, i.e. groups granted differing degrees of estimation and prestige and distinguished by a wide range of cultural differences." (Neale, 1981:71)

1. Upper class: Aristocratic, landholding, authoritarian, exclusive.

2. Middle class[6]: Big industrial and commercial property owners, senior military and professional men, aspiring to acceptance by the upper class, deferential towards the upper class because of this and because of concern for property and achieved position, but often individuated or privatized.

3. Middling class: Petit bourgeois, aspiring professionals, often literates and artisans, individuated or privatized like the middle class but collectively less deferential and more concerned to remove the privileges and authority of the upper class in which, without radical changes, they cannot realistically hope to share.

4. Working class A: Industrial proletariat in factory areas, workers in domestic industries, collectivist and non-deferential and wanting government intervention to protect rather than liberate them.

5. Working class B: Agricultural labourers, other low-paid, non-factory urban labourers, domestic servants, urban poor, most working-class individuals whether from working-class A or B households, deferential and dependent.

There were two other important considerations in choosing Neale's model. Firstly, his criteria are based within an explicitly Marxist framework which is consistent with the interpretation in this work; and secondly, in keeping with Marx, Neale included class consciousness in his formulations. However, one danger of using class consciousness as a criteria for class is that it tends to be conservative, dating the first appearance of these classes much later in the eighteenth century than evidence would suggest (see Corrigan & Sayer 1985: esp. ch.5; Scott 1982). Nonetheless, it provides a stronger and more active line of demarcation between the classes that is useful in the later discussion about status and prestige.

Assigning approximate income levels and consequent potential consumer power of each class is a more difficult matter. However, it is a useful exercise in this instance as a means to determine very generally the income split between earning of a subsistence wage and earning enough to enter into the world of leisure consumption. Due to the paucity of studies in this area and length of the time period in question, all that can be done is offer figures for comparison only.

Having put forth such a caveat, there does seem to be a fairly consistent set of figures in the literature, though the figures are clustered primarily in the latter half of the eighteenth century. Schwarz (1982:169) gives a set of figures for the spread of the middle classes based on the 1798 parish tax assessments in London:

---

[6] This would also include what Everitt (1966:71) called the 'pseudo-gentry' - "predominantly urban families who, by their manner of life, were commonly regarded as gentry, though they were not supported by a landed estate" - part of the leisured middle class.

Middle Class Rank	Median Income[7]
I	£61
II	£66
III	£79
IV	£128
V	Over £200

While Schwarz makes "no pretence at considerable accuracy", it is fair to consider class III as solid middle class[8]. However, whether classes I and II

> should be considered middle class is open to doubt...however, they are included, not because persons with incomes exceeding £60 a year were intrinsically 'middle class' - a skilled artisan could earn as much - but because, comprising some 10 to 12 per cent of London's population, they formed a group between the 'comfortable' middle classes ... and the two-thirds or more of London's population too poor to be liable to assessed taxes at all, while they merged with neither of them. (Schwarz, 1982:168-169)

Being somewhat more succinct, D.E.C. Eversley (in Lemire, 1990:70n) proclaims that in the late eighteenth century a family income of at least £50 per year is necessary before consumer participation can begin.

More importantly for present purposes is the percentage of the population that can be included with those that consume 'non-essentials'. If classes III and above are considered from Schwarz' data, those of the middle and upper classes would constitute about 25 percent of the population. Adding classes I and II would increase that figure to 30 percent (Schwarz, 1982:169). Brewer (1980:333) noted that by 1780, 20 to 25 percent of the population had family incomes between £50 and £400. It can be reasonably concluded that, conservatively, 25 percent of London's population could participate in leisure or status consumption to varying degrees through the eighteenth century.

One final caution must be made about the income figures in this work. As a result of the growth after the Restoration, there was extreme economic competition. Borsay (1982:9) noted that the growth of the middle and middling classes had

> intensified the whole nature of the struggle [with the upper classes], forcing even those who were well established, such as the country gentry, to spend a great deal more than they were used to, simply to

---

[7] The traditional English monetary conversion is used throughout. 1 pound sterling (£) = 20 shillings (s); 1 shilling = 12 pennies (d) (pence is used as the plural of penny). Guineas were gold coins issued between 1663-1813 = 20 shillings or 1 pound; Crowns are silver coins = 5 shillings (also issued as half-crowns). On February 15, 1971, the pound was decimalized into 100 new pennies (p).

[8] Schwarz (1982:177) found that between one third and one half of London shopkeepers were middle class, based on income; shopkeepers comprised more than one third of those earning more than £75 per year.

> remain where they were. In the maelstrom of post-Restoration social life, it was necessary to run, even to stand still.

Undoubtedly this competition forced real wage values to drop as the eighteenth century wore on; indeed, from about 1740 until the Napoleonic Wars, real wages fell steadily (Lee and Schofield, 1981:29; Schwarz, 1985:25).

2.2 Consumption and Leisure

One of the assumptions prevalent throughout this work is that people will tend to consume beyond a subsistence level. This is particularly true with non-durable entertainments like music performance and theatre. The motivating force for such consumption is still a subject of debate. However, much of my argument relies on the validity of such assumptions. The following section will briefly investigate some of the current theories of consumption and leisure, as well as to try to present a picture of why such forces were coming to the fore particularly in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

It is evident that in London immediately after the Restoration there was something of an urban explosion. The re-establishment of the court of Charles II brought the aristocracy, court functionaries and assorted sycophants flocking to London to be close to royal influence. This in itself built an ideology that wealth and status were equated with power, one not entirely without justification. To provide an example, many have accused Charles II of forcing English music into a period of decline after the death of Henry Purcell in 1695. Hyde (1985:176-7) attributes this

> in part to the continental style of music introduced by Charles II on his return from exile in France. The taste of those close to the throne gradually changed and now favoured foreign composers. They lavished adulation upon singers and instrumentalists from abroad.

As a consequence, "Those who could afford it aped royalty and hired foreigners to serve them" (Westrup, 1941:84).

It was not just emulation of the court by the aristocracy and gentry that drove such trends in London and elsewhere. In London particularly, there was a shift in power within the upper and upper-middle classes. Between the Cromwellian and Restoration Parliaments, the monarchy was progressively stripped of power. The power shift from the monarchy to the aristocracy and gentry was accompanied by a subsequent shift in income and wealth through land appropriation and redistribution after the Commonwealth. This led to the aristocracy becoming much more active and influencial patrons of art and music as the monarchy lost its power as a cultural beacon (Hyde 1985:49).

The return of Charles II to the throne marked a clear transition point from which to begin the examination of the capitalist relations in London. The Restoration also marked a change in virtually all facets of social and economic life, moving away from Puritanism back to a court-based, more hedonistic outlook. The end of the Commonwealth and its civil conflicts gave rise to a greater optimism and an opportunity to, in a sense, reconstruct the whole of urban life.

However, there were important preconditions to the formation of post-Restoration attitudes. The consumption patterns of the growing and increasingly wealthy middle classes did not simply appear without precendent. The feudal relations surrounding agrarian life set an important foundation to the understanding of the accumulation and consumption of status objects by the middle classes. As an introduction to the body of this chapter, I will attempt to identify the basis for some of the consumptive attitudes that carried over to the post-Restoration period[9].

The most important feature of the English feudal aristocracy was the ownership of property. The value of such ownership exhibited itself in two ways. The first was as the very concrete qualifications for participation as a member of the ruling elite. As Beckett (1986:3) notes

> Property qualifications existed for a whole series of positions, from the right to vote, through places in local and central government, and even the shooting of game. At other times it was covert, such as careful gradations within the peerage, or the right to wear the red coat on the hunting field. Always it was there, and virtually no one rose through the ranks without the requisite property holding.

The second feature of property ownership was substantially more visible than the first. The appearance of prosperity and leisure was essential to provide a convincing image of someone fit to rule over the county and to placate the lesser aristocracy and peasantry. As Stone (1984:300) notes, in the county, "the elite 'are like little kings', their authority being dependent upon their ability to display opulence, dispense bounty, and offer hospitality." These characters also differentiated the aristocracy from the rising merchant wealth that was beginning to compete for rural power through the acquisition of county seats and huge landed estates.

The importance of the large country estates was entrenched through the late Elizabethan period (1570-1615) when a series of 'prodigy houses' were built.

---

[9] One aspect that is implicit within the bulk of the argument needs to be stressed. The functioning of the feudal system relies on extra-economic means of extracting labour from the peasants. Thus there was a very strong tendency toward an attitude of benevolent paternalism among the feudal aristocracy. With the shifting of productive relations to that of capitalist and wage-labourer, much of the feudal ideology that supported the feudal productive relations could not support the capitalist relations, allowing the new merchant capitalists to revise many of the aristocractic values to establish their own prestige hierarchy. For much discussion of the implications of the shift from feudalism to capitalism, see Hilton (1976).

Constructed by the public servants of Queen Elizabeth and James I, "the object was to maintain favour by providing lavish hospitality on the occassion of a royal visit" (Stone 1984:301). The political motives became more overt in the second period of country construction, 1680-1730, when the "great Whig politicians built on an extravagant scale in order to be able to keep open house for the neighbouring squires and gentry, so as to consolidate their local power base" (Stone 1984:301-2).

Two trends are implicit within these great residential displays. First, to maintain the prestige of the house and family, the trappings that fill the house must be of a similarly high quality and value (Weber 1989:295). The objects that filled the houses and the behaviour that supported such displays became the hallmark of a 'gentleman' and thus became highly sought after by those wanting to raise or maintain their status[10].

The second trend, which is more apparent in the second period of estate construction, is of primarily an economic character. The huge increase of merchant income and the loss of much aristocratic wealth in the civil wars of the Interregnum created much tension between the two groups. Indeed, immediately after the Restoration, "there was widespread suspicion among the members of the landed interest that their coffers were being drained in extravagant foreign wars[11] to benefit a new monied interest of stockjobbers, bankers, and government contractors" (Stone 1984:21).

The suspicion was also expressed by the merchants, particularly concerning the aristocratic outlook and ideology. Though merchants wanted to take advantage of aristocratic prestige, there were new questions regarding lifestyle. For example, with education:

> Business men followed in the footsteps of the hereditary landed elite in the way they educated their sons, but at all times before 1800 they had significantly less enthusiasm about the merits of a university education. No doubt they wanted to give their sons the same genteel education as their social superiors, but were more afraid of moral corruption by the habits of idleness, gambling, and sexual promiscuity for which university students were notorious from 1670 to 1820. (Stone 1984:243-44)

The purpose of this brief exposition is twofold. Firstly, to demostrate that the consumption patterns of the middle classes were not conceived in a vacuum; there was a long history behind the establishment of status indicators and their differentiation. Secondly, the emulation of the aristocracy by the middle classes was not simply blind copying. There was clearly a rejection of many aristocratic values by the middle classes and thus there was a reconfiguration of the status hierarchy. As a result there was something of a separation between the leisure activities of the aristocracy and the middle classes, both ideologically and financially. Aristocratic patterns of opulence and financial excess were replaced by the new middle classes with an attitude of economic prudence and responsibility, undoubtedly born of the fragile nature of their non-landed wealth (Stone 1984; see also Bush 1984; Girouard 1978).

---

[10] There was a very notable trickle-down effect of this prestige competition. As Stone (1984:303) notes, "Lower down the social scale, the same atmosphere of status competition prevailed. Everyone built to outdo his neighbours, thereby to earn the prestige which could be translated into power."

[11] The wealth extracted through British colonial expansion was immense. For example, Thomas Rumbold bought his estate, Watton Woodhall in 1778 for £85 000 from profits made in India between 1760-1770 as a member of the Council of Bengal, Chief of Patna, and Governor of Fort St George. He returned to India in 1777 as Governor of Madras. He returned to England in 1780 "with replenished coffers, allegedly the fruits of rampant corruption" (Stone 1984:202). Interestingly, Rumbold sold Watton Woodhall to Paul Benfield in 1794 for £150 000. Benfield was a government contractor - the money: profits from the Seven Years War.

The diffusion of power, wealth and an interest in the arts, coupled with increasing time of residence in London due to the court and Parliament, brought a great deal of expendable income and a general dynamism to the city (Corfield 1990:140). As a fledgling capitalist economy, London merchants and entrepreneurs attempted to meet, if not create, a demand for consumer goods among the monied classes. The combination of expendable wealth, a new booming consumer industry[12] and the continuing image of court life, imbued display with a very strong personal statement of worth and value.

2.2.1 Consumption Models

At the center of this swirl of city life was consumption. As a driving force in the capitalist economy it cannot be denied its due. Therefore, it will be useful to review some of the current theories of consumption (from McCracken 1990:60-62):

1. Greed and Vanity. This model is built on the premise that all consumption is driven by greed on the one hand and vanity on the other. It creates difficulties because to state universality of these traits creates a very psychologistic foundation. To deny the cultural universality of such traits "is to acknowledge that notions of greed and flattery are the causes and therefore also the *consequences* of our own cultural traditions" (p. 60).

2. Status Competition. A model built on the work of Veblen and Simmel[13], it is based on the supposition that "the consumer revolution has been driven by the effort to use the status symbolism of goods to claim a higher social status than one's own"

---

[12] From the sixteenth century onward, the consumer market in England, and indeed the Continent and then the New World, is now recognized as being much larger than production historians have previously estimated (Thirsk 1990:52).

[13] See for example Veblen (1934) and Simmel (1978).

(p.60). From this follows a variety of questions regarding the definition of rank and the possible strategies of the appropriation of status markers by the lower classes.

3. Pleasure. This model is based almost exclusively on a psychologistic premise. It proposes that "consumer goods...promise the consumer the opportunity to insinuate the pleasures of the imagination into the realities of the world" (p.61). The promise is never fulfilled and thus the consumer moves on to the next object. There are far too many suppositions to support the validity of such a model on its own merits.

4. Hegemonic Control. This model holds that consumer objects, being primarily controlled by the ruling class as the owners of productive capital, can be used to coerce and distract the subordinate classes and thus maintain power. Capitalist society as a consumer society, "becomes a place charged with new opportunities for false consciousness and manipulation" (p. 61). This position may in fact be valid in a contemporary capitalist system where class consciousness is much more developed and defined. While there was certainly a clearly identifiable class consciousness among the aristocracy, the construction of the consciousness precluded any possibility of recognizing any kind of challenge from another class. Indeed, historically it is apparent that the aristocracy "were so bewildered and disarmed by the consumer revolution" (p.62) that they were powerless to maintain their best status defence: controlling consumption.

5. Culturalist Model. This model is developed and put forth by McCracken himself. He states that "consumer goods are first of all the media for cultural meanings, that they give voice to the categories, principles and processes of culture" (p. 62). It provides something of a synthesis of the previous models while broadening the scope in which consumption occurs and has meaning[14]. The assumptions of this model are the most applicable and important to this work. Therefore, further comment should be made about the pertinence of the similar works of Pierre Bourdieu and Jean Baudrillard.

Much of Bourdieu's argument emphasizes the construction of the social and cultural foundation from which status objects as 'cultural capital' are evaluated (Bourdieu 1977, 1990). In particular, he argues very strongly in favour of a process of legitimization that reinforces the cultural meaning and prestige of objects (not unlike that implied in the hegemony model). Class behaviour and values, argues

---

[14] McCracken (1988:136n) stated in a previous work that "consumption refers...to the processes by which consumer goods and services are created, bought, and used....It adds to the traditional emphasis on the act of purchase, the *product development* that must precede purchase and the *product use* that must follow it."

Bourdieu, are reinforced and perpetuated through the subconcious absorption and reiteration of these values by individuals. Jenkins (1992:141-142) offers a concise summary of Bourdieu's primary argument:

> (a) objective *conditions of existence* combine with *position* in social structure to produce (b) the *habitus*, 'a structured and structuring structure', which consists of (c) a 'system of schemes *generating* classifiable practices and works' and (d) a 'system of schemes of perception and appreciation' or *taste*, which between them produce (e) 'classifiable *practices and works*', resulting in (f) a *life-style*, 'a system of classified and classifying practices, i.e. distinctive signs'.

Baudrillard argues two related points but does so drawing much more explicitly from Marx. In the first case, Baudrillard argues that in carrying Marx's analysis one step further, objects appear not only as having autonomous value, but also become signifiers constructed by cultural context which influences subsequent consumption of the object (Baudrillard 1975). In this way, status and prestige can be gained by individuals through selective consumption of particular objects.

Secondly, objects that tend to be prone to such status construction share two characteristics. In the first instance Baudrillard (1990:44) notes the polarization of use-value and exchange value: "At one extreme, the strictly practical object takes on the social status of a machine. At the other extreme, the pure object - devoid of function, or abstracted of its use - has a strictly subjective status..." The second characteristic is the necessity of inter-object relationships in the construction of prestige value. Through the process of acquisition and ownership that is characteristic of capitalism, the value of objects in relation to each other comes to be based subjectively on their position relative to the buyer. In other words, Baudrillard takes into account the sign value of objects in the negotiation of exchange value.

The most notable feature of all of these models is the shift away from utilitarian or subsistence drives for consumption to an almost exclusive focus on the act of consumption. The differences between Baudrillard and Bourdieu in particular are interesting. Baudrillard tends to emphasize the relationships between objects in the process of constructing prestige value which is then consumed by the subject. In constast, Bourdieu appears to favour the development of the social values of the subject in evaluating the prestige or status level of classes of objects. Nonetheless, both authors are in agreement with McCracken that the establishment of the cultural value and meanings of objects is central to the process of consumption.

The emphasis on the act of consumption over the object is an important analytical distinction for two reasons. Firstly, it helps to explain much of the breakdown of traditional consumption patterns. After the Restoration

> the wealthy elites, the middling ranks, and even some of the labouring population demonstrated a willingness to alter their purchasing practices and to buy...completely new sorts of commodities as substitutes for various traditional items. (Lemire 1990:66)

Undoubtedly, new forms of traditional items would also be included in this transition.

Secondly, and more importantly for this work, placing the focus on the act over the object removes many of the difficulties in attempting to discuss music as a sound object in a historical perspective. The closest one could come to discovering such information is to reconstruct the conditions of consumption of the sound object. In other words, the only way to understand music in its historical context is to understand the material conditions surrounding its consumption. Focussing on the act of consumption not only emphasizes the material conditions of consumption (and production), but could also provide greater insight into the nature of the sound object itself than could be gained by limiting analysis to the sound object.

2.3 London

Demographically London was growing at an incredible rate. The breakdown of the feudal organization in the countryside, the onset of civil war in 1642 (the beginning of the Commonwealth), and the rising influence of a cash economy in London drew huge numbers of people to the city. This is reflected in the population growth over 200 years (after Wrigley 1987:133; figures are rounded and approximate):

Year	Population
1600:	200 000
1650:	400 000
1700:	575 000[15]
1750:	675 000
1800:	900 000

Wrigley (1987:135) notes that in the period from 1650 to 1750, after birth and death rates are factored in, an annual net migration to London of 8 000 to 12 000 people was necessary to maintain population growth.

A logical consequence of this population growth was the new demand for food production. Because so much of the population was now in the city and not part of the rural productive work force, greater productivity was demanded of the countryside. It has been estimated that increasing exports, decreasing imports and increasing domestic consumption necessitated a 12 to 25 percent increase in agricultural productivity between 1650-1750. Concurrent with this increase was the development of the food distribution system necessary to deliver products[16] (Wrigley 1987). Borsay (1982:1-2) describes the dynamism of the time:

---

[15] With this figure London becomes the largest city in Europe.

> coastal and inland ports funnelling agricultural produce, raw materials, and manufactured products around the coastline and overseas; road towns servicing the rise in inland trade and personal mobility; market towns catering for an increasingly specialized economy that required inter-regional movements of products; towns servicing rural-industrial areas and accommodating a growing share of the manufacturing process; other centers tilting themselves toward the rich pickings of an increasingly sophisticated consumer economy, providing 'luxury' products, services, and facilities.

Wrigley (1987:151) lists six wholesale changes resulting from these developments:

1. The creation and development of a single national market for a variety of goods and services, allowing 'specialization of function' to be developed and the 'economics of scale' exploited;
2. Increasing productivity of agricultural methods so the cost of food will drop and real wages will rise; allows greater proportion of employment in secondary and tertiary industries without prejudicing the food supply or raising prices;
3. The development of new raw material supplies that are resistant or immune to rising marginal costs of production;
4. The creation of increasing numbers of credit and commercial facilities to exploit the latent strengths of the new economy;
5. The development of better transport networks to reduce cost and transport time with greater predictability and access;
6. The securing of a steady rise in real incomes 'so that the volume of effective demand rises *in toto* and its composition changes with the diversion of an increased fraction of the total purchasing power into the market for the products of industry.'

Once these changes began to solidify in the mid-eighteenth century[17], London emerged as the largest manufacturing center and had the highest real wages in Britain (Nicholls 1985:424; Wrigley 1987:147).

---

[16] A similar development occurred with fuel and the shift from wood to coal. This demanded a subsequent technological development - Newcomen's engine to drain the water from the coal mines. Along with this development came the delivery system; one estimate states that at one time half of the English merchant marine were involved in the Newcastle coal trade (Wrigley 1987:145-6).

[17] It must be remembered that the roots of the development at home and the expansion abroad were founded in part some 150 years earlier by the formation of the Levant Company (1591) to exploit the Middle East, and its successor of sorts, the East India Company (1600). The importance of these companies, among others, in supporting capital expansion after the Restoration is central to the understanding of the economic climate of the time; that of exploitive imperialism and industrialization. For more information the reader is referred to Epstein (1968) and Hannay (1926) on the Levant Co.; Golant (1975), Griffiths (1965) and Huq (1964) on the East India Co.; and Barber (1975), Ehrenberg (1928: esp. pp. 345-349) and Elphinstone (1887) on British foreign policy and finance in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Two areas did not develop quickly enough to support the expansion of merchant capital. The first was currency. As London moved into the eighteenth century there was a mounting demand for cash; trade in kind was becoming less and less acceptable. The recoinage of 1696 drastically undervalued British silver coins which resulted in a vast number being melted down for bullion and/or exported. The consequence was that only the worst coin was left in circulation. By 1762, it was estimated that there was only about £800 000 of silver coin in circulation (Brewer 1980:335).

Though a connection to the 1696 recoinage can only be postulated, there was a concurrent increase in the development of credit as a customary means of conducting transactions in the latter part of the seventeenth century. Through the eighteenth century investors came to rely more heavily on credit. However, such reliance was precarious. In boom times, credit was easily obtained in exchange bills, commodities, or trade credit. When the bust(s) came, the credits were called due and the investments collapsed[18]. Such occurrences left the middling groups particularly vulnerable[19] because of the lack of landed property to hold as assets against such credit (Brewer 1980:336).

The final burden of the middling classes as they tried to become established through the eighteenth century was taxation inequity. The differences between the upper-middle class and the upper-class was not always financial; it existed in the form of the wealth. The upper-classes very often had the majority of assets in landed estates; the middle-classes tended to have assets in movable properties. Of the taxes collected in the course of the eighteenth century, land taxes reached a maximum of 32 percent (1715 to 1790). Movable property taxes (customs and excise duties for example), however, were "regressive, indirect taxes on commodities which hit all consumers no matter how humble" and constituted 74 percent of tax revenue between 1750 and 1780 (Brewer 1980:338).

2.4 Political Representation

One of the most important developments through the post-Restoration period and beyond was the fight for the developing middle classes to gain political representation. During the Civil Wars of 1642-1660, "[t]he monarchy, the House of Lords, the Anglican Church, and the administrative and judicial apparatus of the

---

[18] According to Brewer (1980:335), the most spectacular slump was the South Sea Bubble of 1720, when "trade all over the country came to a standstill."

[19] For example, in 1776, most of the 2500 people being held in debtors prison were tradesmen, middlemen, shopkeepers and small producers (Brewer 1980:336).

Prerogative courts all came toppling down together" (Stone, 1980:24). At the conclusion of the war, Charles II was restored to the throne on the agreement of the Parliament with provisions for shared power. However, the balance was delicate at best. In only four decades, there occurred three major political events that greatly influenced the later ability of the middling classes in to gain legislative representation and protection (after Stone 1980: 24):

1. Exclusion Crisis (1678-81): A reaction to the Popish Plot[20] it was a effort by the Whig Parliament to pass two Exclusion Bills that would have prevented a now Catholic James, Duke of York (brother of Charles II) succession to the throne. The populace feared not only religious domination by the Catholics. At a state level, greater Catholic power was perceived as increasing the possibility of reversion to an absolutist government (like France) so soon after gaining Parliamentary power. Therefore, the panic of the Plot and the Crisis served to strengthen the anti-Catholic sentiment already present in England at the time, furthering attitudes of intolerance (Ronalds 1937). Though the Parliament was strongly challenged by the monarchy, it maintained its power against Royal pressure. Demonstrating its resilience went a long way to improve confidence in parliamentary action.

2. Glorious Revolution (1688-89): James II eventually gained the throne after the death of Charles II in 1685. However, James II was soon replaced for 'misdeeds' by William and Mary (Prince and Princess of Orange), now King and Queen of England. William and Mary almost immediately passed the Act of Toleration and the Bill of Rights (1689). The Bill of Rights proved a turning point - during the drafting of the Bill, "men addressed the essential issue of the seventeenth century - whether the King or Parliament should exercise sovereignty - and chose Parliament" (Schwoerer 1980:227). The long-term influence of the Revolution was the securing of "the liberties, religion, property, and independence of the nation" after the failure of so many previous attempts (Jones 1972).

3. Hanoverian Succession Crisis (1712-1715): Shortly after the Tories succeeded in seizing power in the Parliament, George I (first Hanoverian king) gained the throne. The Tories were then ejected by the Whigs, all of which was followed by the subsequent failure of the Jacobite Rebellion[21]. Such rapid and confused changes

---

[20] A fabrication that alleged a plot to murder Charles II by the Jesuits to effect a Catholic takeover of the English throne. Thirty-five alleged conspirators were executed in connection with the plot. Immediately after a second Test Act (1678) was passed that barred all but Anglicans from holding public office.

[21] The Jacobite Rebellion was an unsuccessful attempt by the adherents of James II, led by James Francis Edward Stuart, to regain the throne. A later attempt (1745-46) led by Charles Edward Stuart, the Young Pretender, had initial success but was later crushed.

in the political influence in the Parliament undoubtedly gave the upper-middle class opportunities to forward their own interests in government.

The net political result of these upheavals for the middle classes was small[22] but significant. Some representation could be gained in the Parliament, though it was often through backroom manipulation of Parliamentary influence. The 'monied' middle class could use economic influence to get favourable decisions from Parliament[23]. The half century after the Restoration is perhaps best summarized by Pocock (1980:8):

> [T]he conflicts of the seventeenth century can only be thought of as involving an institutionalized hereditary aristocracy and an institutionalized gentry, both of them living in counties and exercising patronage over boroughs. The [bourgeois] are present and important, but do not possess the institutional means of independent political action.

2.5 Education

Identifying the preconditions for the expansion of a consumer market for printed music is difficult. However, it is fair to assume that there must have been some level of musical understanding before growth was possible. Such inquiry inevitably leads to questions of the level of musical literacy, and literacy in general.

Throughout the Christian world, the Church has played an important role in educating the masses in music (Weber 1989a:49). The existence of monastic song schools that fed and clothed children in return for choir service were common in the late middle ages. Such schools were dealt a serious blow during the monastic dissolution (1523-1539) during the reign of Henry VIII (Hyde 1985:119-120). Though many of the schools were destroyed, the core of well-trained musicians that served them continued to require work. The Court of Elizabeth I then became a fertile ground for the (re)development of the arts generally, and music in particular.

Instrumental music in the Church diminished somewhat after the Elizabethan period, but the rise of congregational singing during the Commonwealth undoubtedly had a renewing effect on the popular knowledge of music. Hunter (1990:230) notes that musical literacy, though perhaps harder to determine than language literacy, really only requires the ability to read, not to write. Thus continued exposure to church songs would, at the least, breed some familiarity with music and musical notation.

---

[22] Brewer (1980:338) notes that there was much anger "felt by the industrious classes at the way in which they were forced to underwrite the system of corruption and its flunkies [which] was compounded by the singularly ambivalent relation of the middling sort to the Court and central government." Indeed, what was even worse was their dependence on the monied classes in Court, Parliament and the vagaries of the London social season for their employment.

[23] The monied interests could use lobbying, allies in Parliament, or the threat of cutting off loans to the royal treasury. Merchants and investors, in return for credit services, increasingly demanded a change in foreign and military policy for the protection of their trade routes and overseas market expansion. They also wanted preservation of overseas trade monopolies and the dismantling of the corrupt system of economic controls over internal trade, industrial production, land use, and interest rates (Stone 1980:29).

Music also played a part as a component of secular education, though the cost and availability tended to favour the more financially secure classes[24]. In the upper classes, music education was split by sex. Women were formally trained in music (especially in the seventeenth and early eighteenth century) using either printed music or by rote. However, their socially restricted role ensured that such training would receive little notice beyond being a marker of family status. The reverse was true for men: music was mostly discouraged as an avenue of education, but they had the freedom to perform publicly if they desired[25] (Leppert 1988:199). In constrast, squires were trained in music in addition to the practical skills necessary for loyal service to his lord (Hexter 1950:3).

The middle classes did not differ much in educational philosophy, in as much as they emulated the upper classes (Leppert 1988). The difference being that if music was recommended at all, it was for interest and amusement only, not as a requisite social skill. The middle class emphasis on the recreational aspects of music seems to have expanded in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries with the rise of expendable income and leisure time. The important consequence for both middle and upper classes was that such exposure to printed music ensured the development of music suitable for a growing number of literate amateur musicians. Indeed, as Weber (1989:297) notes, there was a "need to write down to the performing level of amateurs...[and that] 'amateur' music was devoid of complex or sophisticated harmony or counterpoint."

A very interesting development that illustrates the growing interest in creating music was the publication of at least 20 musical 'dice' games, published in a variety of editions and languages throughout Europe between 1757 and 1812[26]. These publications "made it possible for the person ignorant of music to write minuets, marches, polonaises, contredances, waltzes and so forth by selecting bits of prefabricated music through the use of chance operations [either dice or tops]" (Hedges 1978:180).

---

[24] Much more emphasis was placed on music in the secular schools moving into the mid-nineteenth century. The Tonic-Sol-Fa method of teaching was developed in 1867 by Curwen and Hullah, which "more especially addresses itself to the working class" (Cunningham 1980:103). Though certainly outside the temporal scope of this work, it is notable that such efforts at expanding music education were being made.

[25] As James Puckle [1713] commented on music eduction for gentleman: "Musick takes up much time to acquire to any considerable perfection...It's used chiefly to please others, who may receive the same gust from a mercenary; consequently, is scarce worth a gentleman's time, which might be much better employ'd in the Mathematicks, or what else would qualify him for the service of his country" (in Leppert 1988:21).

[26] The most important editions of the these games are chronologically as follows: Kimberger, J.P. (1757) *Der allezeit fertige Menuetten- und Polonoisen-komponist*. ['The ever-ready minuet and polonaise composer']. Berlin: Winter. Anon (c.1758) *Ludus Melothedicus ou le jeu de dez harmonique*. ['A method for melodies, or the harmonius dice game.'] Paris: de la Chevadiere. Bach, C.P.E. (c.1778) *Einfall einen doppelten Contrapunct in der Octave von sechs Tacten zu machen ohne die Regeln davon zu wissen*. ['A method for making six bars of double counterpoint at the octave without knowing the rules.'] Berlin: Lange. *Gioco*

The first two games published outlined the two different methods for playing the game. The first, published in Germany in 1757, broke the music into measures, to be reordered based on dice and tables. The second, published in France in 1758, broke the measures down into individual notes. The first English publication was by Piere [sic] Hoegi (c.1770, London: Welcker) and had a perhaps overly optimistic title: *A Tabular System Whereby the Art of Composing Minuets Is made so Easy that Any Person, without the least Knowledge of Musick, may compose ten thousand, all different, and in the most Pleasing and Correct Manner.* Though presented as games requiring no prior knowledge of music, there is an obvious assumption of some musical literacy and proficiency. The only way to really tell if the game has been executed properly is to play the result to hear if it is 'pleasing and correct'.

Though not much more will be said of musical literacy, one final point on literacy in general is warranted. It has been suggested by Walvin (1984) that the importance of London as an economic and cultural center in itself would demand higher literacy rates [27] than elsewhere in England. Walvin (1984:92-93) notes that

> the nature of economic life in urban areas demanded greater literacy as an employment skill...formal instruction was more easily organized in urban than in rural settings...[and that] access to the printed word was arguably as important in maintaining and furthering literate interests as the acquisition of basic literacy.

The combination of at least some literacy with increasing access and leisure time would prove to be a powerful stimulant to the development of a musical mass culture.

---

filharmonico (1793, 1812 - Naples: Marescalchi) has been attributed to Haydn; two dice games have been attributed to Mozart, the first published 1796 (K^6 C 30.01) (Hedges 1978)

[27] Walvin (1984:93) reports that by the end of the eighteenth century, approximately 92% of men and 74% of women in London had basic literacy.

Chapter 3
Data

The discussion to this point has focused on a variety of the social, economic and political relations that had occurred from the Commonwealth well into the eighteenth century. The goal has been to set a foundation on which to build the discussion of musical life in London. Music in society at that time (as it is now) was ubiquitous; it penetrated much more deeply into everyday life than did other arts:

> [Music] loomed large in the rites and pleasures of the court, the tavern, the fair, and the home; people danced, drank, and courted to it. The rise of public opera and concerts in the seventeenth century simply put such pursuits on a grander scale. Musical events helped people meet and talk as well as listen....[M]usic obtruded upon everyone in powerful ways both in public and in private....people heard much the same music in many of these places. (Weber 1984:190)

Weber hints at two activities which proved to be fundamental in the development of musical life. The first is the public performance of music. People began to see the possibilities of building and exploiting new kinds of relationships based on public attendance at music houses and concert halls. The second was the printing and publishing of music. For dissemination and market expansion, printing and publishing proved crucial in establishing a wider popular market for music.

3.1 Public Concerts

Defining and summarizing the growth of public concerts at this time would seem comparatively easy. However, some important distinctions must be made to clarify the limits of the information presented in this next section. The ideal definition of a public concert[28] for this work is the performance of instrumental or vocal music for an audience whose entry is restricted to the payment of admission. In reality, such a definition makes it very difficult to gather information due to the lack of many necessary records.

It has therefore become necessary to make some assumptions about the nature of rising concert life in London. There were many different types of 'public' musical performances occurring at the time. Instead of excluding all events in which evidence could not be found for proof of admission, it has been decided to present as completely as possible the potential range of public performance activities. When evidence is available for either giving admission criteria or stating such events were exclusive to certain groups, it will be noted.

---

[28] Young (1980:616) states that 'concert' derives from a conjunction of concertare (Lat.: 'contend, dispute') and consortium (Lat.: 'society, participation') and was "brought into English usage in the seventeenth century to signify a musical performance, as a rule by more than one executant."

3.1.1 Early Theatres

In a manner similar to the social patterns established by the feudal aristocracy, London theatres were important in setting a precedence for the consumption patterns of public entertainment[29]. Prior to the Restoration, two theatres foreshadowed the class and income split that was to mark music over a century later. Of two theatres built in 1576, 'The Theatre' was the first 'playhouse', erected immediately outside the London city limit by James Burbage. It could accommodate a large number of patrons so the admission prices could be kept low (between one penny and sixpence). The second, the 'Blackfriars Theatre', the first indoor theatre, was converted from an abandoned monastery near St. Paul's Cathedral by Richard Farrant. Much smaller, it was also more costly, "which excluded all but the more wealthy and learned segment of the public" (Rea 1990:539).

A clear trend began in the late sixteenth century when the divergence of the 'public' and 'private' theatres occurred. Public theatres (Table 1) were large open-air theatres intended as a 'mass entertainment enterprise' (estimated capacity up to 3000) (Oates & Baumol 1972:141).

Table 1

Periods of activity of public theatres in London, 1575-1642
(Adapted from Oates & Baumol1972:148)

Date[30]	Name
c.1576 - c.1599	The Theatre
c.1599 - c.1613	First Globe
c.1613 - 1642	Second Globe
c.1577 - c.1626	The Curtain
c.1579 - c.1595	Crosskeys Inn
c.1580 - c.1595	Newington Butts
1587 - c.1616	The Rose
1595 - c.1621	The Swan
1600 - c.1621	First Fortune
c.1622 - 1642	Second Fortune
c.1605 - 1642	Red Bull
1616 - c.1632	Hope

---

[29] Such patterns were being established both in London and on the Continent - See Weber (1975).

[30] Indented dates indicate formation of subsequent theatres in the same location.

These theatres were quite successful; the falling real wages of the time were to the advantage of the labour-intensive theatre. It was estimated that a play could begin to profit with a run of only two weeks (Oates & Baumol 1972:151-52).

Private theatres (Table 2), in contrast, were much smaller indoor theatres (estimated capacity of 400 to 600).

Table 2

Periods of activity of private theatres in London, 1575-1642
(Adapted from Oates & Baumol 1972:148)

Date	Name
1608-1642	Second Blackfriars
c.1613 - c.1616	Porter's Hall
1616 - 1642	Phoenix or Cockpit (Drury Lane)
c.1629-1642	Salisbury Court

Growing out of a tradition of entertainments given by companies of exclusively juvenile boys drawn from choir schools, these theatres did not begin to become commercially important until about 1600. The first adult theatre group to perform in a private theatre was the King's Men (Shakespeare's group) who bought Blackfriars in 1608 (originally used by the boys from Queen's Chapel) (Oates & Baumol 1972:142).

Another distinguishing point concerns theatrical patronage of the period. Patronage was not a primarily economic obligation as was commonly done on the Continent. Though theatres were self-sustaining commercial enterprises, the patron was, nonetheless, an essential figure. Harbage (in Oates & Baumol 1972:143) explains that:

> What a company could normally expect from its lord was a document declaring that its members were his servants and should be respected accordingly, occasional intercession on their behalf, if they got into trouble, a payment when they performed before him (such as they would receive in similar circumstances from any other lord), and, occasionally, a 'badge' or livery - an allowance of cloth so that they might wear the colors of his house.

Such protection was required by Queen Elizabeth in an Act passed just a few years earlier in 1572 (6 Elizabeth c.5) that stated that

> all Fencers Bearewardes Comon Players in Enterludes & Minstrels, not belonging to any Baron of this Realme or Towardes any other honorable Personage of greater Degree...whiche...shall wander...shalbee taken adjudged and deemed Roges Vacaboundes and Sturdy Beggers, intended of this present Act (Oates & Baumol 1972:143n).

It would not be to far-fetched to suggest that in providing patronage, such as it was, that patrons would not only ensure a supply of performers to enjoy virtually at their command (and little expense), but they could subsequently enjoy the prestige and status that would accrue from being the patron of a successful company.

Within a space of about five years, the private theatres were proving more profitable than the public theatres[31]. The incredible disparity in admission prices between the two types of theatres made it clear from the beginning that 'the private theatre was *not* for the common man' (Oates & Baumol 1972:143). That the private theatres succeeded at all is a strong comment on the upper class demand for entertainment. At that time the public theatres were on the south side of the Thames; the private theatres on the north side, in the City proper. The rapidly growing Puritan sentiment spread among the solid middle-classes in the City, with a somewhat lesser effect in the upper classes. The new Puritanism resulted in some successful efforts to close down the theatres as "a neighborhood nuisance, not to mention a moral threat" (Oates & Baumol 1972:142). Such opposition forced the theatres even further into the realm of the upper classes, appealing to a very small, affluent audience[32]. There is also evidence to suggest that because the plays took place during daytime working hours. This may have contibuted to the falling attendance at public theatres, as they depended on daylight for operation, whereas the private theatres used alternate sources of lighting. It may also have been a trend that had run its course among the lower classes[33] (Oates & Baumol 1972:147).

* * *

The growth of public music performance followed primarily two routes. The first was from the theatres, developing out of the pre-existing tradition of dramatic works presented with musical accompaniment (despite being interrupted during the Commonwealth). The popularity of the incidental music after the Restoration grew to the point where there was no longer any effort to integrate the musical and dramatic elements (Tilmouth 1957:22). Scott (1937:388) maintains that by about 1700 music in the theatres was so predominant that it "doubtless accounts for the comparatively small number of other concerts being given, apparently, at this period."

---

[31] General admission at the public theatres was 1 penny, the best seats at 3 pence and the 'Lords' seats at 6 or even 12 pence. Private theatres started at 6 pence, up to 1 shilling or 1/6d: "occupants of sixpenny seats were sneered at as 'groundlings'" (Oates & Baumol 1972:143). Converted price estimates translate sixpence seats into about $20 US in 1972 dollars.

[32] It is of interest to note that only a third (3 of 9) public theatres survived until the Puritan ban in 1642, compared with three-quarters (3 of 4) of the private theatres.

[33] It seems that after about 1610, the lower classes were returning to more traditional forms of entertainment: bear baiting, prize fighting, visits to madhouses and public executions (Oates & Baumol 1972:147).

While Scott's assertion of the amount of music in theatres may be true, there was in fact a large amount of music elsewhere. Furthermore, the relationship between music and the theatres was proving problematic. Music had to contend with the fact that there were other non-musical performances occurring, limiting the amount of music on any night, and restricting the numbers of possible occasions for music-only performances.

Though many other theatres opened before the Restoration, they were all closed by Parliamentary edict during the Commonwealth. However, immediately on regaining power in 1660, Charles II struck down the Puritan edicts and promptly granted royal patents to establish two royal theatre companies. The first went to William Davenant to build a theatre for the Duke's Players. In 1671, the Duke's Theatre, Dorset Garden (designed and built by Sir Christopher Wren) was completed. The second went to Thomas Killigrew[34], for which Wren also built the first Theatre Royal, Drury Lane in 1674 for the King's Players (Rea 1990:541). Prior to this, however, Killigrew had made two abortive attempts to bring Italian opera to London; the first in 1664 when the theatre he planned to build in Moorfields came to naught[35], the second in 1667 when attempts to develop opera at an existing theatre also fell through[36](Westrup 1941:78).

There were also some problems with the production of dramatic works through the latter seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. As will be demonstrated shortly, music was developing its own set of venues and clientele. Reinforcing a long history of state control of the theatre[37] a theatrical Licensing Act was passed in 1737. This Act gave the Lord Chamberlain extensive powers of censorship for all plays, as well as the power to protect the monopoly of the two patent theatres in London[38]. The response by theatre managers was to fill out their programs with musical items[39] (Rea 1990:542). This would indicate that there was probably less music in the theatres through the early eighteenth century than was initially proposed.

---

[34] Milhous and Hume (1986:54) date Killigrew's patent at 1662 and Davenant's at 1663. Whether these are the original dates of assent or renewals is not known.

[35] Samuel Pepys (1985:411-12), at the King's Playhouse on 2 August 1664, was told by Killigrew that he was "going to build a house in Moorefields [the Nursery] wherein he will have common plays acted. But four operas it shall have in the year, to act six weeks at a time - where we shall have the best Scenes and Machines, the best Musique, and everything as Magnificent as in Christendome; and to that end hath sent for voices and painters and other persons from Italy." Oddly enought, the failure must have come to the opera only, as Pepys notes on 24 February 1668 (p.880) they went "to the Nursery...where the house is better and the Musicque better then be looked for, and the acting not much worse, because I expected as bad as could be: and I was not much mistaken, for it was so."

[36] There was also a patent to Giulio Gentileschi to build a theatre and have sole privilege to present Italian opera in London. The plan never came to fruition and nothing more is heard of him (Westrup 1941:77).

[37] In the Elizabethan period, companies had to pay sizable fees to "the Master of the Revels, a sort of censorship arm of the Lord Chamberlain himself", based on the type of material they wished to perform (Oates & Baumol 1972:143).

[38] Later, in 1753, the Lord Chamberlain issued an injunction to the four principal theatres in London "not to act any Plays, Oratorios or any other Theatrical Performance in Passion Week for the Future on any Pretence whatsoever" (Drummond 1978:277).

The second route that concert development followed was through the appropriation of existing spaces for the purposes of creating music. Music does have advantages over theatrical works in this context. Music not only is a far more portable entertainment, but it also is less formal with respect to access to repertoire. The long traditions of music in the home and church makes it a much more familiar pastime than acting. Coupled with the age old link between music and drinking (Hackwood 1985 for example), it seems only appropriate that to a great extent, the public concert tradition grew out of the public houses[40] of the day.

The end result of the flexibility of musical performance was the wide variety of places where such performances took place. There were, however, two main areas which supported public performances: rooms for concerts and pleasure gardens. The first, as mentioned above, are the inns and taverns that began to put aside rooms to be devoted periodically, or exclusively, to presenting music to their patrons. The growing popularity of such practices forced performers and audiences to larger rooms (often used for other purposes), then finally to the dedication of rooms for exclusive concert presentations. The urge to see and be seen, and the growth of true leisure in the middle and upper classes, also led also to the development of pleasure gardens and spas. Among many other entertainments, some of a highly questionable nature, music became a primary attraction.

3.1.2 Music at Public Houses

A few words of clarification need to be made regarding the differences between inns, taverns and alehouses. The inn was the largest of the three types of establishments. Developing from the highway stopping houses of Roman times, it was characteristically a place where a traveller could stop, get food and lodging for himself[41] and companions, and for the transport animals. An Act of James I (1603) defined the intended use of inns as being for the "resort, relief, and lodging of wayfaring people, travelling from place to place, and for such supply of the wants of such people as are not able by greater quantities to make provision by victual."

---

[39] Though the apparent intent was to dilute the dramatic element, the result was the presentation of something very like a concert.

[40] Public houses as referred to here are inns, taverns and ale-houses. More will be said on this distiction in section 3.1.2.

[41] It was very dangerous and suspicious, thus rare, for a woman to travel on her own.

However, it warns that inns "are not meant for the entertainment and harbouring of lewd idle people, to spend and consume their time and their money in [a] lewd and drunken manner" (Hackwood 1985:181).

The differences between taverns and ale-houses were small but significant. Taverns were traditionally the retail outlets for the Vintners Company and its members. Selling the more expensive beverage, the tavern attracted a higher class clientele. Thus, as Bishop Earle noted in 1628, "A tavern is a degree above an ale-house, where men are drunk with more credit or apology" (Hackwood 1985:76). The ale-houses, not surprisingly, served cheaper local ales to the lower classes.

With the post-Restoration flurry of activity, inns became increasingly important as social centers and carriage stops, and thus became larger and more impersonal in its services. Ale-houses, on the other hand, "supplied a purely local need, boasting its own circle of regular customers, its own collection of taproom wags and characters, and frequently its own specialities in the way of food, drink, games, and amusement" (Richardson 1934:39). Into the eighteenth century the tavern and the ale-house somewhat melded - the new coffee-houses stole many higher class customers from the taverns. By 1800, the tavern had largely disappeared: "most of the so-called taverns one finds were indistinguishable from larger alehouses, dispensing beer and spirits rather than port or claret and catering to the bottom half of the social order" (Clark 1983:14).

While inns, taverns and ale-houses are oftened referred to synonymously, and in many cases are functionally synonymous, there are clearly important differences between them. However, in the post-Restoration period, the useful distinction is perhaps between the inns and the ale-houses with regard to the class differential of the clientele. The taverns seem to have catered to the middling ranks of working class patrons, despite the extra expense for wine over beer. Nonetheless, throughout the work, the term 'public house' will be used as a generic term for these types of establishments. Specific exceptions will, of course, be noted.

The following list (Table 3) is a compilation of some of the public houses where music performance has been documented. The difficulty in dating such events is obvious; the dates given throughout are those of the earliest documented references to music performance. There very likely was music performed at most of these locations (and undoubtedly many others) before the first references to it were recorded.

Table 3

London public-houses where music is known to have been performed, 1648-1800.

Date	Name[42]	Location	Source[43]
1648	Black Horse	Aldersgate St. (Black Horse Court?)	El:17
1658	‘Blew Bell’[44]	London Wall	El:14
c.1659-60	Mitre[45]	Fleet Street	Sc1:456
c.1664	Mitre[46]	Wapping	El:16; Hy:69
c.1664	Mitre	London House Yard (St. Paul’s Churchyard)	El:15
c.1665	Music House[47]	Stepney	Sc1:450
c.1670s[48]	Black Swan	Bishopsgate	Hy:70
c.1689	The Two Golden Balls[49]	Bow Street	Yo:40
1691	Queen’s Head[50]	Paternoster Row	El:50
Pre-c.1700	King’s Head	Gray’s Inn (north of Lincoln’s Inn Fields)	Hy:71
c.1700	Castle Tavern	Paternoster Row, St. Paul’s, Cheapside	El:50
1710 (1726)	Crown and Anchor Tavern	Arundel Street in the Strand	El:51-2
pre-1719	The Two Golden Balls[51]	Great Hart Street , James St., Long Acre	Ti:15
1731	Devil Tavern	possibly Temple Bar, West Fleet St.[52]	Sc2:379

---

[42] For further information on tavern signs, their meanings and history, see Endell (1968).

[43] The following source abbreviations apply to Tables 3, 4, and 5: ‘El’ = Elkin (1955); ‘Sc1’ = Scott (1936); ‘Sc2’ = Scott (1937); ‘Ha’ = Harley (1968); ‘Hy’ = Hyde (1985); ‘Ti’ = Tilmouth (1957-8); ‘C-M’ = Croft-Murray (1980); ‘Fo’ = Forsyth (1985); ‘Yo’ = Young (1965)

[44] Harley (1968:139) notes a contemporary observer refers to a visit to the ‘Blue Balls’, which John Banister also frequented. This may or may not be the same place.

[45] “There were a great many ‘Mitre’ taverns in old London, so called because built on land belonging to a bishop or abbot.” (Elkin 1955:15) The ‘Mitre’ is also known as the ‘sign of the spiritual helmet’ (Hyde 1985:69)

[46] Harley (1968:136) notes that this Mitre may have been in a place called Music House Court.

[47] Scott (1936) gives strong evidence that this music house, whose sign was the head of Charles II was not the same place as the King’s Head. Maurice Greene began concerts in 1731 after quitting the Academy of Ancient Music (Young 1965:75).

[48] There is a reference to Samuel Pepys having attended, therefore it was in existence sometime between the 1660s and 1680s (Hyde 1985:70).

[49] It is unknown whether this is a previous location or a separate establishment from the ‘Two Golden Balls’ in Great Hart Street.

[50] Previously ‘Crosskeys’ (see Table 1) it was reputedly changed to ‘Queen’s Head’ on the accession of Queen Elizabeth. The conflict in dating the names may be an error, or may indicate a second location of the same name. The Queen’s Head is mentioned in relation to music in a 1691 tract *The Last Search after Claret* (Hyde 1985:73).

[51] It was also used as a painting auction gallery, similar to the Vendu (Tilmouth, 1957-8:15).

[52] There is a mention of a Devil Tavern at Temple Bar in the late seventeenth century, but it is not referred to in connection with music until 1731 (Scott 1937:379).

With music commonly associated with public houses, this list can only be optimistically considered suggestive of the London area[53]. However, taverns[54] and ale-houses in particular were, in fact, one of the only public places music could be heard during the Commonwealth, despite the Parliamentary edict to the contrary[55]. Evidence of this is seen in references to music being performed during the Commonwealth at the Black Horse and the Blew Bell in London, a center of Puritan activity.

It is instructive to note that virtually all of the establishments listed were either in or very near the wealthier West End of the City[56] (the exceptions are the Mitre in Wapping and the Music House in Stepney). There is little doubt that most were attended by the middle and upper classes with some regularity (the literacy required to create contemporary accounts suggests a level of education available almost exclusively to the higher classes). Three other early taverns include the Globe (1661), the King's Head (1665) and the Mitre (pre-1700), all located in Greenwich (Scott 1936; Elkin 1955). These taverns (or ale-houses) deserve mention because of their early date, but they have been excluded from the list due to their distance from London. Consequently it is questionable that their existence had any influence on the developing musical culture in London. The popularity of these taverns could be associated with their proximity to the public theatres south of the Thames prior to the Commonwealth.

There are two dissenting opinions concerning who deserves the honor of having presented the first public concert. The earlier of the two is a reference by a contemporary to a public concert organized by singer/composer Ben Wallington, held at the Mitre Inn (unknown location) in 1664 (Young 1980:616). Unfortunately, no corroborating data on this event has been found.

---

[53] Taverns have a very long history in England, dating to the twelfth century. In 1309, 354 taverns were reported operating in London (Clark 1983:11).

[54] The question of whether many of these establishments were taverns as previously defined is unclear. No discussion of the differences between taverns and ale-houses has been encountered in the music literature. Therefore, there is the distinct possibility of the use of tavern as a catch-all term for any type of public-house. It is assumed that if 'tavern' is in the name of the establishment, the function and clientele would be consistent with the definition offeredin the text.

[55] Those musicians who did not have legitimate positions were also searching for new income. Cromwell's Third Parliament (1656-57) "passed an 'Act against vagrants and wandering idle dissolute persons' in which it was ordained that 'if any person or persons, commonly called fiddlers or minstrels, shall at any time after the 1st of July be taken playing, fiddling or making music, in any inn, alehouse, or tavern, or shall be taken proffering themselves, or desiring or intreating any person or persons to hear them play or make music, in any of the places aforesaid' they should be adjudged rogues, vagabonds and sturdy beggars, and be punished accordingly." (Scott, 1936:448)

[56] This information was extrapolated from Barker and Jackson (1990) and Margary (1981). Settlement of the wealthy in the West End was also influenced by the more stable land distribution compared to the fragmented East End, the proximity to both Westminster and the City, and finally, the prevailing winds came from the west for three-quarters of the year helping to keep the air clear of the smog from coal fires (Beckett 1986:267).

The second contender for the first public concert is the more commonly accepted of the two. John Banister the elder, having been dismissed from Court service in 1667[57], then became something of a concert impresario. He is reported to have held a public concert in a room of his house (the 'musick school') on 30 December 1672. Hyde (1985:174) declares: "to John Banister of London belongs the honor of arranging the first series of concerts for the general public at which payment was accepted..."

The concerts began every afternoon at four o'clock, as advertised in the *London Gazette*. Soon, larger accommodations were needed, and Banister relocated

> to a large room in Whitefriars, neer [sic] to the Temple back gate, and made a large raised box for the musicians, whose modesty required curtaines. The room was rounded with seats and small tables ale-house fashion. 1s. was the price and call for what you pleased. There was very good musick, for Banister found the means to procure the best hands in town... (Roger North; in Forsyth 1985:26).

Banister kept moving his series. In 1673, he moved to Chandos Street, Covent Garden; in 1675, his 'Academy' moved to Lincoln's Inn Field; and in 1678 he moved his concerts to a house on Essex Street off the Strand (Young 1965:35).

The Castle Tavern also proved to be the site of a seminal event in about 1700. A somewhat informal music meeting developed there that would become known as the Castle Concerts. A decade or so later, about 1710, the meetings moved down the road to the Queen's Head. Once again, in 1724, the meetings moved back to the Castle Tavern; this time under the formal name of the Castle Concerts (Elkin 1955:50).

A similar event occurred at the Crown and Anchor Tavern in 1710. The Crown and Anchor Concert was started that year "for the preservation of old masters of every country...[and] has long endeavored to check innovation" (Hawkins, in Elkin 1955:52). The reported date of charter of the concerts into the Academy of Ancient Music (or the Academy of Vocal Music) was January 1726. Harley (1968:142) maintains the charter date of 1710; the difference likely lies in a confusion between the date of the beginning of the meetings and the actual date of charter of the Academy.

---

[57] A Court musician since 1660, he was made Chief of his Majesty's violins 1663, then dismissed in 1667 for suggesting that English violinists were better than the French (of whom Charles II had grown very fond during exile) (Elkin 1955:19-20; Harley 1968:135).

Regardless of who claims honors for the first public concert, the public houses played an important part of the social development of the day. In addition to music, they served as conduits for both trade and leisure activities, ranging from cock-fighting to flower shows (Thomas 1964:66). As such they set a precedent for the middle class and working class social clubs established through the eighteenth century, and which proved to be the launching pad for collective bargaining and class representation (Walvin 1984:149).

Conversely, public-houses were also used to forget the worries of the working world. Such was the purpose of the 'mughouses'. Mughouses were likely ale-houses where regular customers had there own mugs, and where singing was a special feature on various evenings. John Timbs, a contemporary observer, noted that "the room is always so diverted with songs, and drinking from one table to another to one another's healths, that there is no room for politics or anything that can sour conversation" (Hyde 1985:80).

A factor that may have played a part in Banister being credited for the first concert over Wallington was the Great Fire that destroyed a huge portion of the old City in 1666[58]. Undoubtedly many of the locations in Table 3 would have been destroyed, along with many undocumented locations. Interestingly, however, any of the taverns and inns west of Chancery Lane would have been spared. Thus, locations supporting music performance in the more affluent West End were not destroyed, allowing the middle and upper classes to continue to attend performances.

There was a second consequence of the loss of performance venues due to the Great Fire. New venues needed to be found to support/exploit the growing interest in music performance. Though the connection may ultimately be found to be spurious, the growth of alternative venues in the 1670s may be partially indicative of such motives by landlords. One could further account for the delay by the construction time, or delays in the actual documentation of the performance event.

3.1.3 Concert Clubs

In keeping with the growth of public concerts, more organized, formal concerts did not begin until 1678 with the 'Small-coal Man's Musick Club'(Table 4), a room over a shop fitted with a small organ. The man in question was Thomas Britton (1644-1714[59]), a seller of small-coal who had a passion for books, music and knowledge in general. His enthusiasm attracted some of the finest performers[60] and audiences (Young 1980:617). The concerts were initially free of charge. However, Britton eventually began charging 10 shillings per year subscription; coffee was available for 1 penny per cup (Forsyth 1985:27).

---

[58] The reader is referred to pp. 34-35 of Barker and Jackson (1990) for a reproduction of a 1667 survey of the damage.

[59] Unfortunately for Britton a mysterious voice told him that his end was near - he became so alarmed that he died. His ventriloquist friend undoubtedly rethought the practical joke afterwards (Forsyth 1985:338n).

The next location of great interest to concert goers was the York Buildings, located between the west end of the Strand and the Thames, which proved to be a hive of musical activity. The Villiers Street Room, in the York Buildings, has been called the "first room specially designed for commercial concert giving" (Harley 1968:147)[61]. Many societies began to meet there with varying frequency, including the 'Society of Gentlemen lovers of Musick', who organized many concerts, particularly St. Cecilia's Day celebrations (Forsyth 1985:27).

Table 4

Music rooms and music clubs known to be active, 1672-1781, listed chronologically from first reference.

Date	Name	Location	Source
30 Dec. 1672	'Musick-School'	Dogwell Court , Lombard St., Whitefriars	El:18
1678	Small-Coal Man's MusickClub	Aylesbury St., Clerkenwell	El:23
1680-28 March 1734[62]	Villiers-St. Room (a.k.a. York Buildings Room)	East Villiers St. off the Strand	El:29
c. Nov. 1685	Dancing school	Walbrook	Ha :149
1689	Vendu	Next to Bedford-gate in Charles St., Covent Garden	Sc2:381; El:37-41
c. Jan. 1693	Large room	Freeman's Yard, Cornhill	Ha:148
Dec. 6 1697-c.1738	Hickford's Room	Between Panton and James Streets	El:42-44
c.1738-c.1780	Hickford's Great Room[63]	No. 41 Brewer Street	El:44
Dec. 1751-c.1781	Great Concert Room	21 Dean Street Soho	Fo:28

Because the York Buildings also provided a very fashionable residential address, the Villiers St. Room (or York Buildings Room), is occasionally referred to after the current resident - two known examples are 'Sir Richard Steele's Great Room' and 'Mr. Topham's Great Room' (Scott 1937:383). Such variations in nomenclature illustrate 'how extraordinarily slipshod they were over such terminological matters in the seventeenth century'. This provides yet another reason why accurate verification of the actual number of concert rooms in London at this time is so difficult (Scott 1937:381).

---

[60] Reciprocating, Dr. Pepusch wrote a trio sonata titled *Smalcoal*.

[61] However, an advertisement on 23 November 1685 refers to concerts at the 'Dancing School in York Buildings' (Scott 1937:380), thus, claims of primacy are suspect.

[62] Scott (1937) gives this date. Elkin (1955:37) notes the performance of *Esther an Oratorio* on July 20, 1732, "appears to be the last event worth recording in the history of the York Buildings concert room."

[63] Burney noted in 1744 that "the only subscription concert at the west end of the town at this time, was at Hickford's room or dancing school, in Brewers-street." (Elkin:45) It measured 15.2 x 9.1 x 6.7m high with a coved ceiling and a platform at one end. By mid-century it was the place to attend concerts.

A third room is also of importance. Starting as an unnamed Bow Street, Covent Garden concert room, the concerts held there were joined with those held at York Buildings in October 1689. The Bow Street concerts had apparently been regarded highly as it claimed royal patronage through proprietors Robert King and Johann Franck[64] who had received a royal patent from William III to hold concerts there. In 1691 it moved to Charles Street into a room that Scott (1937:381) claims 'was expressly built for concerts'. The room is subsequetly referred to as 'La Vendu' or 'Vendu'[65].

Hickford's Room (originally Hickford's Dancing Academy and Auction Room), was built in 1672 as part of Colonel Panton's royal patent to develop the area (Scott 1937:380). Though the room was contemporaneous with the Villiers Street Room (1674), concerts were not held at Hickford's until later, due to the room's principal use as a dancing school. When concerts began there, it soon became one of the most fashionable concerts in London, as was Villiers Street. Records of admission prices are sporadic, but the following have been noted: 20 November 1697 - half crown (two and a half shillings); May 1706 - 5 shillings; May 1725 - 1 Guinea (20 shillings) for a 4 concert subscription or 6 shillings per ticket (Elkin 1955:44; Scott 1937). After the room moved to Brewers Street c.1738, Hickford's was apparently the last subscription concert available in the West End of London (Burney [1744]; in Elkin 1955:45).

3.1.4 Concert Halls

The final stage in the development of the performance venue was the building of large rooms and halls to accommodate the now prodigious audience for instrumental and vocal concerts. Though commonly called 'rooms' as above, these rooms tended to be regarded as music venues in their own right, as opposed to being associated with a person or organization. Some of the most notable are:

---

[64] A previously successful opera composer in Hamburg, Franck seems to have been a taskmaster - as Kapellmeister at the Court of Ansbach, he murdered a subordinate musician (Young 1965:42).

[65] One author suggests that the name is simply a corruption of 'venue'. If this is true, then it could have been expressly a concert room. Alternately it has been suggested that 'Vendu' is a term for sale or auction - the room was reported used for the sale of pictures. If this is true, then claims of exclusive musical use are false.

The Music Room[66], Holywell St., Oxford. Built in 1748, it is arguably the first auditorium built solely for the performance of musical works. Some say it was built in response to a series of concerts Handel gave in Oxford in 1733. It is virtually certain the first piece performed there was Handel's *Esther* (at 5 s. a ticket). Weekly concerts were given consistently from July 1748 to May 1789, then again from 1 May 1793 (Mee 1911:2). In 1763 it started its first subscription concert series at one Guinea per season (Hyde 1985:200, 202; Young 1980:617).

Carlisle House, Soho Square. Discussed in greater detail below, its mainly known for being the location of the Bach/Abel concert series, the Soho Square Concerts, from 1765 to c.1769. Concerts were held occasionally after c.1769; the house was demolished in 1803 (Forsyth 1985).

Mr. Almack's Great Room, King's Street, St. James. Later renamed Willis's Room. Similar to the Carlisle House, it is notable for have been the site of the Bach/Abel concerts c.1769. Little else is known of the room.

Pantheon Theatre, Oxford St. Opened in January 1772[67], it was the crown jewel of London theatres of the time: "Obviously no expense had been spared on its design or decoration and it attracted not only the most famous performers of the day, but also the most glittering audiences which often included the King and Queen" (Hyde 1985:186). Its designated purpose was for "masquerades, balls, and music, with orchestral concerts every two weeks followed by a ball" (Forsyth 1985:32). It had additional rooms where card games or meetings were held.

When the King's Theatre, Haymarket, burned down in 1787, a four year license was granted to the Pantheon to stage Italian opera while the King's Theatre was rebuilt. Taking almost four years to be converted for opera production, the Pantheon was ready at about the same time the new King's Theatre was opened. Both produced operas and both lost money until the Pantheon burnt down on 14 January 1792 (Forsyth 1985:34-35).

Tottenham Street Rooms Built by musician Francis Pasquali in 1772, the Concert of Ancient Music (separate from the Academy of Ancient Music) held regular concerts in the rooms. The rooms were renovated in 1785 when the Concert of Ancient Music received royal patronage from George III. The rooms fell into disrepair in the 1790s, forcing the Concert of Ancient Music to move to a new hall set on the east side of the rebuilt King's Theatre, Haymarket (King's Theatre Concert Room) in 1794 (Forsyth 1985:40).

---

[66] Though Oxford is also outside London proper, the importance of the construction of the Music Room deserves to be noted. Increasing ease of travel and greater population density would allow attendance to be considered an option to West End residents, compared to eighty years earlier. The dimensions of the room were 20.0 x 9.8 x 9.2m high.

[67] It should be noted that other cities and towns in England during the second half of the eighteenth centuries had also developed a strong concert and theatre life. Both Birmingham and Manchester had thriving theatrical and musical facilities prior to 1770 (Borsay 1990:190-92).

Hanover Square Rooms[68]. Opened in 1775 with a concert by part-owners, J.C. Bach and C.F. Abel, it became famous for the Bach/Abel Concerts, the Professional Concerts given from 1783 to 1793, and finally the Salomon Concerts from 1786. Many of the works of Haydn and Mozart had their British premiers at these concerts (Hyde 1985:187).

3.1.5 Pleasure Gardens

From the late seventeenth century to the mid-eighteenth century, the gentry and the landed aristocracy began spending much more time in London and environs during the off-season (May to October) instead of returning to the country (Tilmouth 1957:23). This increased dramatically the numbers who did stay in the off-season (the 'pseudo-gentry', the monied middle classes and the Court attendants). Going for walks ('promenades') was a common recreation, but with the theatre season in hiatus, all classes searched for more in the way of entertainment. This provided an important incentive behind the rise of pleasure gardens (Table 5). They were essentially parks or open areas that had been cordoned off to supply entertainment to those who paid an admission.

Of this collection of pleasure gardens, the most widely regarded and emulated were the Vauxhall Gardens and its rival, the Ranelagh Gardens :

> Tree-lined avenues were laid out, with fountains, statuary, lamps, musicians, food stalls and dining booths. Many provincial 'Vauxhalls' were named after the famous Spring Gardens of south London, while others aped 'Ranelagh', the rival venue at Chelsea, open to great fashionable success in 1742...Entrance fees preserved some social discrimination, but a degree of hurly-burly and popular support was essential for success. The entire population was given over to pleasure, 'in this age of *Vauxhalls* and *Ranelaghs*', concluded a sober onlooker in 1756. (Corfield 1990:136)

Perhaps the entire population could be 'given over to pleasure' as there were certainly gardens to suit everyone's taste. As mentioned, Vauxhall and Ranelagh represented the most fashionable of the pleasure gardens. This can be attested to by noting that when Vauxhall (which was free from its opening in 1661) introduced the use of tokens for admission, the tokens were rapidly counterfeited. In 1736 this was replaced by a per capita admission of one shilling, unchanged to 1792. Ranelagh was considerably more expensive charging 2/6d. admission, or 5/- on nights when fireworks were presented (Corfield 1990:163n).

---

[68] The dimensions were 24.1 x 9.7 x 6.7-8.5m high. It was known to have held an audience of 800 in about 2000 square feet (Forsyth 1985:39).

Table 5

Pleasure gardens in and near London known to have had music, from 1659.

Date	Name	Location	Source
c.1659-1778	Marylebone Gardens	-----	C-M:177
c.1664-1876	Belvedere Tea Gardens	Pentonville Road	C-M:177
1661: Music intro. 1667	Vauxhall Gardens (prev. New Spring Garden)[69]	Lambeth	Ha: 149; C-M:177
c.1684	Islington Spa[70]	Islington	Ha:150
1684-post 1879	Sadler's Wells[71]	Clerkenwell	C-M:177
c.1685-1754	London Spa	Between Rosomon and Exmouth Streets	C-M:177
1691-c.1750	Cuper's Gardens	Lambeth	C-M:177
c.1697-c.1829	Lambeth Wells[72]	Lambeth	Ha:150; C-M:177
c.1690's	Pancras Wells	-----	Ha:150
18 Aug. 1701	Hampstead Wells[73]	-----	Ha:150
c.1718-pre 1811	Adam and Eve Tea Gardens	Tottenham Court Road	C-M:177
1728-c.1744	Lord Cobham's Head	Cold Bath Fields	C-M:177
c.1737-1750	New Wells	Near London Spa	C-M:177
1740-1813	Marble Hall	Vauxhall	C-M:177
1742-1752	Mulberry Garden	Clerkenwell	C-M:177
1742-1805	Ranelagh Gardens	Chelsea	C-M:177
c.1744-1746	Sir John Oldcastle Tavern	Faringdon Road	C-M:177
c.1745-1849	White Conduit House	Penton Street	C-M:177

On the other end of the spectrum were gardens that were never visited by 'persons of quality'. Of Sadler's Wells, an author of a local travel guide in 1699 suggests that there is far more than music to draw a crowd: for five Guineas a gentleman known as the 'ingurgitating monster' would "swallow a live cock, feathers, spurs, and all" (Tilmouth 1957:27). Epsom Wells was not much different. Though it boasted 'Eight MUSITIANS and a TRUMPET' for the amusement of the patrons, "the fact that ladies were not required to pay anything for admission, makes one wonder whether any ladies other than professionals ever frequented the place" (Tilmouth 1957:24).

3.1.6 Concert Organizations

Implicit within the growth of public music performances is the growth of social support networks. For the most part the audience support consisted of two types. The first encompassed efforts by the upper classes to support public performance in such a way as to not compromise their social standing. This was accomplished primarily through restrictive membership, high admission prices, and emphasizing subscriptions over single ticket purchases. The second type are the middle class organizations that tended to encourage attendance as it was to their advantage - greater attendance leads to greater support for more music of higher quality.

---

[69] The proprietor, Tyers, had provided orchestral music and in 1745 added vocal music (Hyde 1985:183).

[70] Admission for 'watering' and entertainment was threepence (Harley 1968:150).

[71] Pre-1700 music was played from 11AM to 1PM; admission was a sixpence/person (Young 1965:42).

[72] Admission was threepence. Harley (1968:150) A 'Post Boy' advert of 11 May 1697 stated one shilling admission.

[73] Admission ranged from one shilling to half-crown for the concert (Harley 1968:150).

Though there were many organized concerts in the late seventeenth century, it was not until the eighteenth century that such organizations were being granted official charters. As a result much less is known about the organizations prior to gaining a charter. Nonetheless it is useful to note some of the important concert organizations that developed through the eighteenth century.

Benefit concerts. Some of the earliest organized concerts were called benefit concerts. In some senses a 'self-help' undertaking, they were intended to make a profit which would go to the person or persons named (usually, but not always, the main performer). One of the first instances of "For the benefit of..." being used in an advertisement was January 1698:

> In *York Buildings*, On Monday the 10th of this instant *January*, at the request of several Persons of Quality, will be a Concert of Vocal and Instrumental Musick, never performed there before; beginning at the usual hour; for the Benefit of Mr. *King* and Mr. *Banister*. (Scott 1937:387; original italics)

By 1700, benefit concerts were becoming quite common, with increasing numbers of foreign musicians in evidence. Gasparini was reportedly the first of the foreign recipients of a benefit given in 1703, followed by benefits for Gottfried Finger, Baptista Draghi, Margarita l'Epine, and Nicola Matteis (Tilmouth 1957:18; Scott 1937:387).

Royal Academy of Music[74] Incorporated in 1719 (though the paperwork was not completed until 27 July 1728), the mandate for the Royal Academy was primarily to stage opera performances. The charter grants the Academy

> full power and Authority to gather together Entertain Govern Privilege and keep all such Proper and fit persons as they shall Judge necessary for the purposes aforesaid to Excercise and Act Operas And to Exhibit all other Entertainments of Musick within any house built or to be built where the same can be best fitted and rendred convenient and Suitable for the purposes aforesaid... (Milhous & Hume 1986:51)

The Academy is something of an anomaly of the time. Having gained the interest of the King and the Lord Chamberlain, the Academy received virtually everything it required. In addition, instead of collecting subscription dues directly from subscribers, the directors asked for - and received - a royal patent authorizing the establishment of a joint stock company whose purpose was to perform operas.

---

[74] Though opera is not considered directly in this work, the RAM did put on instrumental concerts.

The financing was thus done through a public stock offering, making the Academy legally a corporation. However, the Academy protected their interests (and status) by placing restrictions on potential shareholders. From surviving minutes, the directors insisted that "any prospective shareholder should be personally recommended by a member and approved by the directors before he was allowed to buy in" (Milhous & Hume 1986:55-57). On top of these restrictions was the highly ambiguous admission rules:

> it shall and may be lawfull to and for the said Corporation and their Successors to take and receive of such our Subjects as shall resort to see or hear any such Operas or other entertainments of Musick whatsoever such Sume or Sumes of money as either have Accustomably been given and taken in the like kind or as shall be thought reasonable by the said Corporation in regard of the great Expenses of Sciences Musick and such New Decorations as have not been formerly used... (Milhous & Hume 1986:52)

Apollo Society Concerts. The concerts were initiated in 1731 by Maurice Green, Master of the King's Music. He withdrew from the Academy of Ancient Music and set up a rival concert series at the Devil Tavern. However, by this time a number of other organizations were giving concerts and as a result the Apollo Concerts did not last more than a few years (Hyde 1985:73).

Royal Society of Musicians. The Society was originated in 1738 as the 'Fund for the Support of Decayed Musicians or their Families', the first sustained effort by musicians outside of the guild system to "protect themselves, families and fellows from infirmity, accident and old age"[75] (Drummond 1978:268). Basically an insurance company, membership was by application and subscription. After paying into the Society for a year[76], the subscriber was eligible to make a claim, provided the applicant was both a member and a practicing musician.

The organization began attracting upper class (non-professional) patrons as 'honorary subscribers'[77], perhaps not surprising given that many of the best musicians in London were members and participated in the concerts. The first meeting of the Society was at the Crown and Anchor Tavern. However, charity (fund-raising) concerts were perhaps more important to the Society mandate. The first charity concert (20 March 1739) presented Handel's *Alexander's Feast* at King's Theatre, Haymarket with Handel in attendance. The second (28 March 1740) presented *Acis*

---

[75] As a separate society, the New Musical Fund (NMF) was founded in 1786 "for the relief of Decayed musicians, their widows and orphans, residing in England". Seen as a threat to the RSM, RSM members were forbidden to belong to both the RSM and NMF. The NMF nonetheless differentiated itself as it was aimed primarily at provincial, not metropolitan musicians (Drummond 1978:288).

[76] Initial cost was 1/2 crown per quarter (10 shillings per year). In 1766 it was raised to 20 shillings per year; 1794 it was 1 Guinea (Drummond 1978:270).

[77] Of the 210 honorary members (about half the membership) in 1742, 54 were titled. Approximate overall membership figures: 1739 - 226; 1742 - 421; 1755 - 441 (Drummond 1978:277-8).

and Galatea at the Theatre Royal, Lincoln's Inn Field. The third concert (14 March 1741) was again at King's Theatre, Haymarket, presenting Handel's *Il Parnasso in festa*, plus an assortment of other pieces (Drummond 1978:273-74).

Interestingly, the Society ran into difficulty with presenting concerts in primarily dramatic theatres. When the Lord Chamberlain passed the injunction against theatrical performance during Holy Week, the Society's concerts were also stopped. This removed the availability of one of the few blocks of time when theatres were free. It thus created further scheduling difficulties as the theatres were in use most other days (Drummond 1978:275). In 1785 George III granted the use of 'Royal' in the Society's title and on 26 August 1790 granted the charter of incorporation.

The Bach/Abel Concerts. Soon after J.C. Bach and C.F. Abel met up in London in the mid-eighteenth century, they began to take advantage of the demand for instrumental concerts. Their first concerts were in a 'Great Room' (unidentified) in a converted French church at Spring Garden (not connected to the Vauxhall Gardens) on the northwest corner of St. James Park c.1762[78]. In 1765 the concerts were moved to Carlisle House in Soho Square (an upper class residential square). The house, built in the 1690s had the concert room added by Theresa Cornelys in 1760. Called the Soho Square Concerts they began a subscription at a cost of five Guineas for six concerts (Forsyth 1985:29-32).

Success drove the concerts to a larger venue, Mr. Almack's Great Room in King's St., St. James, c.1769. Concerts did continue at Carlisle House for a short period under Cornelys[79], but she went bankrupt in 1772. With Carlisle House standing empty, the Bach/Abel Concerts returned there for one season. On 28 June 1774, Abel, Bach and Giovanni Andrea Gallini bought an existing house at 4 Hanover Square. The Hanover Square Rooms were built out into the gardens as an addition to the house, becoming "one of the most famous London concert halls of all time, being musically important for exactly one century" (Forsyth 1985:35). The Bach/Abel Concerts continued there to great success from 1 February 1775 to Bach's death in 1782.

J.P. Salomon and The Professional Concerts. After the demise of the Bach/Abel Concerts, the Professional Concerts were initiated the following year by a group of musicians. Among this group was composer and widely known violin virtuoso Johann Peter Salomon (1745-1815). Salomon broke away from the Professional Concerts to begin his own subscription series in 1786. His reputation and concerts brought him great acclaim. The Salomon Concerts eventually drove the Professional Concerts under in 1793. One of Salomon's great accomplishments was being the first to bring Haydn to England[80] (Forsyth 1985:32; see also Roscoe 1968).

---

[78] In June 1764 a benefit concert for and by Mozart and his older sister (nine and thirteen, respectively) was recorded to have taken place in the same room; tickets were a half guinea each (Forsyth 1985:29).

[79] Having first attempted to stage an opera without a license (only the King's Theatre, Haymarket was licensed for opera), she was then driven into bankruptcy in 1772 by the opening of the Pantheon Theatre in nearby Oxford Street. She died in debt in Fleet Prison in 1797 (Forsyth 1985:32).

3.2 Music Printing and Publishing

The most important development in the growing mass culture of music consumption was the growth of the printing and publishing industry. The next section will provide a history of printing and publishing both prior to, and after 1700, followed by a discussion of the various social forces that contributed to the concurrent increases in the dissemination of the music at that time.

3.2.1 Music Printing and Publishing to 1700

Gutenberg's invention of movable type printing in the mid-fifteenth century was a momentous occasion for the written word. It proved to be equally important, but nonetheless problematic to the printing of music. It took another fifty years before such printing principles were applied to music, and then with only limited success. The first known printed music was by Italian Ottaviano Petrucchi of Venice in 1501. It used movable type but required two passes (red lines with black notes) to create *Harmonice Musices Odhecaton A*, a collection of ninety six secular pieces in three and four parts (Chrysander 1877:342; Humphries & Smith 1970:2-3). The first single impression music printing from type was done by Erhard Oglin (Oeglin, Ocellus?) of Augsburg: *Melopoiae sive Harmoniae tetracenticae* (22 August 1507). He later printed *Stella Musicae juvenibus artisque ejusdem novellis* (29 March, 1508).

Though it appeared the Germans had mastered single impression music printing, with the Italians a close second[81], it was not until 1530 that such printing became evident in England. Though such a delay might have occurred for a variety of reasons, Humphries and Smith (1970:2) suggest that the social conditions were not conducive to such development, prior to 1530 "there was little call for experiment[s] in music printing....Secular music was in no demand, and the notation used for the liturgical works was unsuitable for mensural music."

---

[80] During Haydn's visits of 1791-92 and 1793-94, he conducted his London, or Salomon Symphonies (nos. 93-101) at the Hanover Square Rooms, written especially for the concert hall. The string quartets nos. 71 and 74 were written for performance by Salomon at the Hanover Square Rooms (Forsyth 1985:38).

[81] Other printer/publishers of editions in the early sixteenth century were Pierre Attaingnant (Paris); Jacques Moderne (Lyon) and Tielman Susato (Antwerp) (Supicic 1985:254).

This was apparently a difficult time for the fledgling printing industry. It appears that many of the first attempts at music printing were done in the absence of a market demand of any kind. Fenlon (1987) argues that it was not until after single-impression printing was adopted by printers of music (c.1540s) that there was any recognizable interest in printed music. It is interesting that throughout the primacy of single-impression movable-type printing that notes typically had large, lozenge-shaped heads and stood alone[82], despite the development of round-headed notes in 1532 by Frenchman Eleazor Genet[83] (Chrysander, 1877:326).

The first known English work of this type was by an anonymous printer in 1530. The book was of 20 English songs, the cover of which read *In this boke are coteynyd xx soges. IX of IIII ptes and XI of thre ptes.*[sic] (Chrysander 1877:377). English printing continued to develop toward the end of the sixteenth century[84]. However, after 1600 there was a significant slump in development. As Chrysander (1877:377) eloquently notes:

> The glorious reign of Queen Elizabeth shed its lustre on music printing, and England, which fifty years earlier had been nowhere, now became suddenly the first in this field, and, about 1600, produced impressions, by Thomas Este and a few others, of an elegance and solidity which were not surpassed and scarcely equalled in all Europe....After this another dreary time came over England, during which an isolated impression occasionally saw the light to bear witness to the general decline.

The vast upheaval that accompanied the Civil War during the Commonwealth proved to be of some advantage to printing and publishing[85]. However, such advancement was almost entirely due to the efforts of John Playford (1623-1686). He provided the new industry with something of a blueprint on being a successful publisher. Playford followed five rules of publishing (summarized by Krummel 1975:115-121):

1. Music publishing is democratic and patriotic in its function;
2. The music publisher selects particular audiences, and issues texts to meet their specific needs;

---

[82] Though the tied note was first used in written and engraved music in 1611, tied notes in movable type were first introduced by London music printer Thomas Moore in 1687 (not John Playford, Sr. c.1660 as often reported) (Kidson 1918:529). Humphries and Smith (1970:12) identify the volume as *Vinculum Societatis* (1687)

[83] Composer/inventor Genet was also known as Carpentras. Together with typecutter Stephen Briard of Bar-le-Duc and printer Jean de Channay produced *Liber primus Missarum Carpentras* in 1532 at Bar-le-Duc. "No other place and no other printer ever made use of this original innovation; which [in] fact is the most eloquent judgement that can be passed upon it" (Chrysander 1877:326).

[84] A good example of English movable-type printing is John Merbecke's (1550) "The booke of common praier noted...Imprinted by Richard Grafton" (Chrysander 1877:268).

[85] For a partial, but illustrative list of publishers in operation before and after the Restoration, see Appendix 2.

3. Flatter the public with the lowest forms of respect (many of his numerous and attractive title page engravings show performers, mostly buxom women);
4. Keep the customer off balance: emphasize newness, and never publish the same book twice;
5. Work mostly with one printer, but try others for special assignments.

Playford also had the advantage of access to good publishable material and a market. As a Loyalist during the Commonwealth, most musicians (who had held positions at court[86] or were liveried servants) were friendly allies and sources of material. Playford also knew that although the "Roundheads [Puritans] were psalm singers in public, [they were] without doubt...as merry as other folk in private, and [he] could enable them to be so to the top of their bent with...publications of witty catches, and country dances[87]" (Kidson 1918:517).

Playford not only recognized, but exploited the fact that by 1650, "the noble patron had now been superseded by the humble purchaser" (Krummel 1975:116). Efforts to commercialize the music printing and publishing business in the late seventeenth century were only possible because of a new audience: the growing affluent urban middle class that was apparently musically literate as well[88]. This period proved to be the first time in history that this class was large enough to generate a profit for the publishers (see Appendix 3 for an illustrative price listing) (Bradford Young 1985:149) By the end of his life Playford had published nearly fifty works in close to one hundred editions, constituting roughly two-thirds of all music printed in England between 1650 and 1686.

3.2.2 Music Printing and Publishing after 1700

Once Playford had demonstrated that music publishing could be a profitable undertaking printing and publishing could no longer be considered separate enterprises. Most of the printers and publishers at work during this time printed and published other material in addition to music. However, as the market grew so did the publishers, who began to specialize to capture a share of the market. Printing was also breaking down the traditional production-distribution-consumption networks of the copyists, forcing what little work they had left for the printers (Brook 1975:19).

---

[86] For detailed information on the life and economics of Court musicians in England, see de Lafontaine (1909) and Ashbee (1981).

[87] Playford's first publication was "The English Dancing Master" (1650-51), a crudely printed book of 104 country tunes with 'plaine and easie rules' for dancing to them. The book ended up being printed in 18 editions, the last in three volumes in 1728 (Kidson, 1918:517).

[88] Establishing the actual musical literacy of the period is difficult. See section 2.5 above.

The rising demand for quality and quantity by both the public and the publishers forced a reconsideration of printing methods. Increased efficiency led to the widespread adoption of engraving on copper plates as the new method of choice (though this too would be later modified). Two of the earliest known examples of music printed from engraved plates are a lute book by Francesco Canora da Milano (pre-1530) (Krummel 1975:159), and the work by Simone Verovio, (10 November 1586) titled *Diletto Spirituale. Canzonette a tre et a quattro voci composte da diversi ecc*^{mi} *Musici*...(Chrysander 1877:525) First used in England c.1610[89] engraving was seen primarily as an artistic, rather than a technical process. Some time later, Thomas Cross popularized the use of engraving for printing, illustrating the very high level of quality that could be achieved through the publication of large numbers of single song sheets[90] (Humphries & Smith 1970:13-15).

The real value of adopting engraved-plate printing for producing music became apparent in England in part because the English were consuming but not producing printed music. It was the Dutch that truly capitalized on the technology[91]:

> The [Dutch] publishers were almost exclusively engaged in reprinting the music of other countries, with a view to exportation far more than to the requirements of their own country...Consequently a great quantity of music was engraved on copper in Amsterdam about the year 1700. The separate works brought out by the Dutch music-publishers are remarkable only as articles of commerce; the real importance of this manufacture is found in the stimulus which it exerted on England and France. (Chrysander 1877:526)

Engraving music provided further advantage because it was considered a musician's process. Creating an engraving (cutting the image on copper plates) was very similar to writing a manuscript. The suitability of engraving to the peculiarities of music, (chords, clefs, accidentals) was thus quickly established (Krummel 1975:144). Furthermore, the efficacy of engraving to stimulate the publishing industry was obvious. It did not take a great deal of technical knowledge to produce[92] (just copper plates and a rolling press; custom-cut typesets were not necessary as in movable type printing), the capital outlay was reduced to the cost of the copper plates (which could be reused) and the paper, which at that time constituted the largest single expense in printing. Most importantly, there was no longer a reliance on subscription sales to raise capital - engraved plates could be stored and used on demand, thus eliminating finite print runs.

---

[89] Orlando Gibbons issued *Fantazies of III. Parts* between 1606 and 1610 (Humphries & Smith 1970:13). Other early English works include Angelo Notari: *Le prime musiche nuove* and *Parthenia* (no author, William Hole, engraver) c.1613 and *Parthenia inviolata* c.1620 (Krummel 1975:143)

[90] Prior to 1700, with the exception of song sheets, there were probably no more than 40 engraved works printed (Humphries & Smith 1970:13).

[91] However, Brook (1975-6:18n) notes that in France engraving, or intaglio, was free from all restrictions, whereas printers using movable type were controlled by the owners of the *brevet* or the royal patent (*Privilège du Roi*). This meant that printers had to pay Pierre Ballard ('seul imprimeur du Roi') and his descendants for the right to print music with movable type, but not with engraving.

[92] Some cases of learning to engrave with no formal education of the process: psalmodist Beesly or artist George Stubbs (Hunter 1990:228)

The death of John Playford in 1686 left a large niche to be filled. Moving quickly was John Walsh, instrument maker to the King, and the most successful of the English publishers to follow Playford (Weber 1989:295). In occasional partnership with John Hare, Walsh turned publishing into full scale market exploitation in the modern sense[93]. He began to advertise his publications in newspapers, in printed catalogues or on other works. He was a foreign agent for some works while pirating others. Most importantly, he brought to fruition the use of engraving as a printing method through additonal technical innovations which were quickly copied (Humphries & Smith 1970:17-18). The first innovation was to switch the plate material from copper to softer, less expensive pewter. This reduced the cost of initial capital expenses, but also allowed for increased accumulation of plate stocks and thus larger standing catalogues. The second innovation was to speed up the engraving process by partly stamping the plates. This reduced labour and increased print consistency within single editions and among series of publications (Humphries & Smith 1970:17).

Lowered printing cost opened the door to a much wider variety of entrepreneurs to enter publishing, prompting two important activities to occur. First, the conditions were right for the development of a speculative market - the publisher could now afford to print music without having a market already established (not unlike the conditions in the sixteenth century) (Bradford Young 1985:149); and secondly, engraving sidestepped the state restrictions put in place to control type-set printing. As a result, engravers could produce or reproduce material at will without fear of the Company of Stationers (discussed in the following section), who controlled copyright (such as it was) and censorship. Engravers could also take advantage of the ambiguity of ownership[94] that engraving provided, thus making piracy[95] economically feasible (Krummel 1975).

---

[93] In his first 25 years in business, Walsh had issued over 600 works and editions (Humphries & Smith 1970:18).

[94] An interesting foreshadow to the following discussion of copyright is the use of the G or treble clef in moveable type as a trademark: "It is possible that this sign was seen in its day as a special identifying mark of a printer's workmanship, required by agreement among the music printers of the Company of Stationers to be distinctive, and specially cut for each printer." (Krummel 1975:7)

[95] Brook (1975) notes there are two types of piracy: theft of the composer's name (used in place of the real composer) or the theft of the composer's work (republication with no remuneration). Examples of both are

Indeed, Walsh proved to be the role model for such practices. Having started with publishing song sheets, he moved on to anthologies of favourite songs of the day (largely from the London stage, including Handel's operas). Though he could not match the quality of the French publisher Èttiene Roger, Roger's success prompted Walsh to begin to pirate his editions (Bradford Young 1985:150). Hunter (1986:273) notes that despite being regarded as one of the most important men in music publishing history, Walsh used "tendentious, and misleading advertisements, legal manoeuvres and price cutting, in addition to unauthorized reprinting, which many were coming to regard as theft."[96]

3.3 Protection of Works - Patents and Copyright

As with most important social developments, there are long chains of events involved before influences come together. Such is the case with the various devices for protecting artistic works. There is a long and important history behind the development of copyright as it is now understood. The growing wealth of the publishing industry at the expense of composers and authors highlighted the inequity between the two sides. This conflict eventually led to political and legal battles that produced a variety of legislation to try to mediate such inequities.

In the previous section on printing and publishing, the influence of the legal conditions were deliberately avoided in order to present a more complete picture here. Indeed, it was not until the very end of the seventeenth century and into the eighteenth century that protection of the creator's rights became a primary issue. However, when it finally came to the fore, it became the linchpin in the relations between the producer/distributors and the creators, as it still is today.

The following discussion will be chronologically ordered to clearly address each development and to present legislation in its context. In this period of early growth music was not of central concern, getting lumped in with the rest of the printed works. It would take almost two hundred years from the creation of the Company of Stationers (Stationers' Company) in 1557 before music would begin to be granted copyright autonomy.

---

plentiful. Of the first: only 7 of 63 published instrumental works attributed to Pergolesi are authentic; of some 150 symphonies, 80 quartets and 50 string trios bearing Haydn's name, none are authentic. Of the second type: in 1700 in London, 3 versions of Corelli's *Twelve Sonatas, Op. 5* were available: the Rome ed. imported by Banister and King; Etienne Roger's ed. from Amsterdam (sold by Francis Vaillant); and Walsh's copy of the Rome ed. sold to compete with Roger's version (Hunter 1986).

[96] Daniel Wright Sr. and Jr. were less well known than Walsh but were much more prolific pirates. In fact, "they had the audacity to publish a catalogue of their publications containing fifty or so items, many of which were also published by Walsh" (Humphries & Smith 1970:20).

3.3.1 Early Protection of Printed Works

The first law related to the book trade was passed in 1483 (1 Richard III c.4) to encourage foreign printers and book binders to come to England. During the reign of Henry VIII, as the local industry grew, the laws became increasingly restrictive to foreign workers and to the production, contents and distribution of printed matter. In 1556[97] regulatory powers were given to the newly formed Stationers' Company. This shifted control of the press from parliamentary legislation to the growing body of administrative law (Feather 1982:51-2).

At this time there were two routes to gain protection for a printed work. The first involved the entering of titles into the registry of the Company. Works were then protected and managed by the Company through formal recognition by the Crown. The statutes of the Company thus provided a "device to prevent seditious printing, by prohibiting any printing in England except by those registered in its membership" (Bowker 1912:21). The second route involved the granting of special royal patents that might cover the printing of individual titles or all the works of a given type[98]. Grants might be awarded to a printer who was a member of the Company, or to a non-member who would then contract a member of the Company for the printing. Interestingly, under either condition the author or composer had no rights in the product, unless they happened to also be the grantee or a stationer (Krummel 1975:10). As Hunter (1986:270) notes

> Music printing was entirely controlled through the award of two patents, one for psalm books and one for other music. The holders of the latter patent, the 'music' patent - Byrd and Tallis, Morley and Barley - gained little if any economic reward from it, for the only profitable music printing at the time was of psalm books with music. The psalm-book patent eventually and inevitably became part of the English Stock of the Stationers' Company.

As music printing began to diminish in the early part of the seventeenth century, patents ceased being granted or renewed. Thomas Morley's patent expired in 1614, thereby allowing anyone to print music (Kidson 1918:318). Political events then led up to the beginning of the Civil War in 1642. During the Commonwealth when Cromwell and the Puritan Parliament held power, the market for music, and the arts generally, was severely restricted. Edicts of the Parliaments closed theatres and forbade dramatic performances of any kind (Scott 1936:447). Organs were banished from churches, leading the way for the development of the metrical psalm, first introduced in 1659 (Temperley 1980:147). (This not only got the congregation singing, but put many of the parish church musicians out of work. Combined with musicians out of work from the Civil War, there was a glut of unemployed musicians. A desire for work forced them into public-houses, then the only available place for public performance.)

---

[97] Feather dates the beginning of the Stationers' Company at 1557; other sources confirm 1556 (Bowker 1912:21; Holdsworth 1924:362).

[98] Some of the earliest printing patents granted were: 1553 - William Seres to print 'psalter' words only (no music); 1559 - John Day to print psalm books with music; 1575 - Thomas Tallis and William Byrd to print set songs or part songs (general music). This patent also covered printed music and music paper (Krummel 1975:11-15).

At the beginning of the Commonwealth the Long Parliament quickly abolished the Star Chamber[99] and with it the regulations to control the press. Soon recognizing the need to prevent seditious and otherwise unwanted publications, the Parliament passed new edicts restoring licensing restrictions in 1643. Further statutory restrictions exacted a fine of 6/8d. and forfeiture of reprinting of registered books for violation (Bowker 1912:21-22).

At the Restoration in 1660, the Prerogative Courts of Charles I were not revived, allowing Parliamentary control of the press to be maintained. Further strengthening of the existing statutes by the Parliament resulted in what is now known as the Printing, or Licensing Act of 1662 (13 & 14 Charles II c.33) which "supplemented the partially restored powers of the Stationers' Company by granting new powers to the Secretary of State. This is a significant development, for it gave statutory powers to a crown official in this field for the first time" (Feather 1982:52). The Act then had an interesting life:

1664 - Act was renewed (16 Charles II c.8)
1665 - Act was renewed (16 & 17 Charles II c.4)
1679 - Act was allow to lapse.
1685 - Act was revived (James II c.17)
1693 - Act was renewed (4 William and Mary c.24)
1695 - Act was allowed to lapse.

It was the lapse of the Act in 1695 that sparked a heated debate concerning the future of protection (or censorship) of printed matter. As Feather (1980:23) stated

> news of any kind had been regarded as a state secret and its distribution a state monopoly. Until the Revolution [of 1688][100], news, and its dissemination had been effectively controlled by the Secretary of State's office, and the official 'London Gazette' was for long periods the only licensed newspaper.

---

[99] The Privy Council sitting as a court of equity that held a great deal of power under the Tudor monarchs. As Skone James (1971:7) notes, "Until the year 1640 the Crown, through the instrumentality of the Star Chamber, exercised this restrictive jurisdiction without limit, enforcing, by the summary powers of search, confiscation and imprisonment, its decrees, without the least obstruction from Westminster Hall or the Parliament in any instance."

[100] Also at that time was the Act of Toleration (1689) which gave freedom of worship to all Protestants, and by presumption freedom of expression (Feather 1982:60).

The lapsing of the Act was likely due to the realization that the Act was not capable of dealing with the growing volume of publications at this time. In fact, according to Humphries and Smith (1970:23) the Act had effectively ceased to influence the printing and publishing of books and music from about 1680.

It was, however, the High Tories, who held both ministry and House majorities through the end of the seventeenth century and first years of the eighteenth century, that continued attempts to revive the old licensing system. Though the High Tories had royal support, they were defeated on the Occasional Conformity Bill of 1703, signaling the end of their influence. Falling ministerial majorities and continued defeats by the Whigs and moderate Tory coalitions forced the Queen to rescind her support. The ministry 'dissolved in chaos', to be later organized with the moderate Tories in power (Feather 1980:28).

Despite the failure of the High Tories to reintroduce a licensing act, they did succeed in passing legislation that allowed the censorship and prosecution of certain printed material. Though directed at prose publications, they were also applicable to the song sheets and ballad sheets that were becoming more popular. Under the auspices of protection against libel, the legislation fell into three categories (after Feather 1982:60-62):

1. Blasphemous libel. Passed as the Blasphemy Act of 1698 (9 William III c.35) it defined blasphemous libel as "publishing or maintaining Unitarianism or polytheism, or denying the truth of the scriptures, by a person educated in the Christian religion" (p.60). In fact, to deny the Trinity, the truth of the Christian religion and its scriptures, or to espouse polytheism were all common law offenses prior to 1698.

2. Obscene libel. Based on the opinion that "it is an offense at common law...to corrupt the minds of the King's subjects" (p.61) the first conviction was in 1707, but was not made statute law until 1857.

3. Seditious libel. Initially having a broad definition, at its most encompassing the definition was "any verbal, written, or printed criticism of the monarch (and, possibly after the Revolution, and certainly by about 1710, his ministers) was *ipso facto* seditious" (p.62). After the Revolution of 1688, however, such a broad definition was untenable. It had become unacceptable

> to deny the right of parliament to regulate the succession to the throne; to make a political attack on the position of the Church of England within the state; to comment on foreign or military policy in time of war; and to make personal attacks on the monarch or the immediate members of the Royal Family... (p. 63)

Such efforts at control still failed to repress the increased publication of a variety of material, especially newspapers. Newspapers clearly played a very important part in disseminating information of all kinds, particularly the influence on concert performances and the sale of printed music through increased advertising (Tilmouth 1957:16).

3.3.2 Copyright Act of 1710

There were a number of general preconditions necessary before the concept of copyright could be established. Hunter (1986:272) suggests that issues of copyright require 1) the existence of a reproducing medium (printing); 2) an acceptance of the concept of intellectual property; and 3) the rise of the bourgeoisie. Conditions 1 and 3 were almost complete during the negotiation period of the first Act. However, the issues surrounding the concept of intellectual property had not yet been resolved. In fact, though termed the 'Copyright Act', the Act was formally titled 'An Act for the Encouragement of Learning by Vesting the Copies of Printed Books in the Authors or Purchasers of such Copies, during the Times therein mentioned' (8 Anne c.19)[101] (Nichol 1990:110).

Superficially, the beginnings of the Act appear strangely incongruous. The intention of the Act was to establish property rights in the content of printed material. The first argument for the rights of authors in their creations was by pamphleteer Daniel Defoe (then a spy for Robert Harley, a moderate Tory and Secretary of State from the 1704 ministerial shakeup), who proposed in 1707 that supporting authors' rights in their work would encourage the production of learned works. During this time the book trade had also been putting forth petitions for publishing restrictions to protect their interests (and profits) in the material they published.

After seeing the context of the pro-creator lobby, the book trade began to reorient their petitions to Parliament to emphasize the 'encouragement of learning' that protection of printed works would purportedly afford (Feather 1980:33). In their petition to Parliament in support of the 'Bill for Encouraging Learning' the book lobby stated seven reasons to pass the Bill (Feather 1980:34):

1. It confirms common law rights.
2. Common law, however, does not give sufficient redress.

---

[101] This is the correct name for the Act. The use of 'copyright' is a modern addition. The first modern usage of the term 'copyright' is not found in the literature until c.1720, with legal usage not being evident until the latter part of the eighteenth century (Nichol 1990:110).

3. When common law was confirmed by statute in 1662 [the Licensing Act], it encouraged the publication of cheap books, that is books at reasonable prices.
4. If the Bill is rejected the trade will be ruined.
5. The trade has not tried to offend in the years since the abolishment of licensing.
6. If the trade is ruined, the public will not benefit.
7. The Bill will not restrain the freedom of the press.

There is little doubt that these arguments were solely designed to appeal to the Whigs and moderate Tories in power who were against a licensing act[102], but did agree that rights ought to be protected (Feather 1980:34).

Eventually, the Bill did make it through Parliament and was passed 10 April 1710 (8 Anne c.19), hereafter known as the Copyright Act of 1710. Unfortunately, the strength of the book lobby and their influence in Parliament was undeniable. The original intent was to address at least some of the authors' grievances concerning the 'undoubted property' of their work, that an author might 'reserve to himself' all or part of the copyright. By the time it had emerged as an Act of Parliament, virtually every reference to authors had been deleted (Feather 1987:9).

The Act went even further by containing the provision: "...nothing in this Act contained do extend, or shall be considered to extend, to Prohibit the Importation, Vending, or Selling of any Books in Greek, Latin, or any other Foreign Language Printed Beyond the Seas; Any thing in this Act contained to the contrary notwithstanding" (Feather 1980:20). This provision effectively allows any and all imported books public domain, giving free use and profit to English publishers.

Despite such a biased result, there were basic provisions in the Act that formed the foundation for modern copyright. It specified a period of protection for the works in question: copies printed prior to 10 April 1710 were protected for 21 years; copies printed after 10 April 1710 were protected for 14 years, subject to renewal for an additional 14 years if the claimant was still alive at the end of the first term (Skone James 1971:11).

---

[102] The 1710 General Election ended with a Tory majority, with High Tories once again gaining ascendancy. Not surprisingly, a second Licensing Bill was introduced in 1712, but did not reach final reading due to the end of session. In 1714, the Bill was ready for final reading when Queen Anne died, which took support from Bolingbroke and the Bill, destroying both. The apparent silence of the publishers at the death of the Bill seems only explainable by the fact that they had received all the protection and controls they wanted in the 1710 Copyright Act (Feather 1980:37).

Though allowing that property in copies does exist, the cause of later legal battles was the failure of the Act to provide any definition of the nature of the property to be protected. This made it even more difficult to find legal support for the provision that property belonged to its owner for a limited period. Such a contention contradicted the precedents of British common law. When copyright cases were first heard by the Chancery Judges, they based their decisions on the common law assumption of the inviolability of property. As a consequence, in all documented cases of the period, the emphasis of the proceedings was the establishment of proper title. Once proper title was established, the copy "was a much the property of the owner as if he had bought a piece of land" (Feather 1987:7).

The final indicator of the dominance of the publishers over composers in particular, was the failure to fulfil the registration clause of the Act. A copy was deemed protected only if the publisher has registered the volume with the Stationers' Company. However, music publishers apparently denied *en masse* the Act's applicability to music books. Between 1710 and 1780, rarely were more than 2 percent of music books registered annually (the majority of these were letter-press or engraved, self-published books (virtually all of the major music publishers at that time used engraving exclusively). Through the rejection of the Copyright Act's applicability to music, the publishers systematically denied rights to composers (Hunter 1986:278). In 1739 a supplemental act was passed that renewed the Copyright Act of 1710 (the second renewal period for protection - 28 years - had expired).

Two other Acts were passed as a consequent of the 1710 Act. The first was the Engraver's Act of 1735 (8 George II c.13- it was renewed in 1767: 7 George III c.38), based on a petition by artist William Hogarth. The intent was to establish protection for engraved prints in the same manner that printed books received in the 1710 Act. Gaining Royal Assent on 15 May 1735, the Act did establish a term of copyright in engravings for a fourteen year period after publication (Hunter 1987; Feather 1987:8). The implications of this Act are unclear, but it would seem that the engraved frontispieces and/or the music itself done by engraving would have some further protection under this legislation. Whether such protection was ever claimed for engraved music is unknown.

The second act was the Import of Books Act of 1739. Once again the publishers' interests were served. This Act "forbade the import into England and Wales of any book written, printed or reprinted there within twenty years prior to the date of the reprint..." (Feather 1987:13). The intent was straightforward: books which still had commercial value could be reprinted only in England and Wales, not imported, and thereafter only by the owner of the printed copy. The Act did exclude books in Latin, Greek or any of the northern languages. The Act was to apply for a period of seven years, and was renewed in 1747 and again in 1754 (Feather 1987:13).

3.3.3 Music Patents

From 1710 to 1770, many composers and sympathetic music publishers were not comfortable with the 1710 Act. Publishers published unauthorized works with virtual impunity despite the 1710 Act[103] (Hunter 1986:274). As a result composers again began to rely on Crown letters of patent or privileges for protection of their works against copying. For the most part "petitions for privileges were presented for works for which protection under the Copyright Act was in doubt" (Hunter 1986:277). Most of the granted patents (see Appendix 1) covered any works the composer wished to publish for a period of 14 years, which prohibited

> all our subjects within our Kingdom and Dominion, to reprint, abridge, copy out in writing for sale, or publish the same, wither in the like or in any other size or manner whatsoever, or to import, buy, rend, utter or distribute any copy or copies thereof, reprinted or written, for sale beyond the seas...without...consent. (Detail of patent granted to J. C. Bach, 15 December 1763) (Hunter 1986:277).

Two events serve as landmarks on the road to full copyright acknowledgement for composers and their musical products. The first was the decision in a case against a Scottish book publisher, *Becket v. Donaldson.* The second was the result of a petition brought to the Chancery by J.C. Bach and C.F. Abel, in tandem with the booksellers of London, to force a decision on the status of musical works under the Copyright Act (1710). The first decision lent support to the second, finally resolving the ambiguity of the status of printed musical works.

In *Becket v. Donaldson* (1774) a suit was filed against a Scottish bookseller who wanted to reprint a book whose copyright was 'owned' by a London bookseller. However, according to the terms of the 1710 Act, the book's term of protection had expired and had become public domain. In the final decision the Lords of Appeal in Ordinary ruled in favour of Donaldson stating the 1710 Act had precedence over any common law rights which might exist in the work. More importantly, it rejected the notion of perpetual copyright as it existed in common law[104] (Feather 1987:23). Thus the validity of the 28 - year limitation of copyright ownership was finally and unambiguously established (Feather 1982).

---

[103] Composers were continually upset by the income inequity, even when no unauthorized copies were sold. The standard deal between composer and publisher was the one-time sale of the work to the publisher, though sometimes the composer would receive an agreed number of copies, either in addition to or in lieu of payment. Charles Dibdin was one example. Dibdin received £45 for 'The Padlock' (1786) for which the vocal score alone sold over 10 000 copies in 13 years; he received £60 for 12 songs of 'Whim of the Moment' - the publisher's profit topped £500. In fact John Walsh, Sr. left £30 000 on his death in 1736; his son John, Jr., left behind some £40 000 only 30 years later (Hunter 1986:274-75).

Just prior to the decision in *Becket v. Donaldson*, J.C. Bach and C.F. Abel had filed a suit in Chancery (18 March 1773) against publishers Longman and Lukey for unauthorized publication of Bach and Abel's works. However, due to the notoriously slow pace of the courts, the House of Lords had reached a decision in the Becket case before the Bach/Abel suit had been decided. Bach and Abel, together with the London booksellers filed an additional petition in March the following year in an effort to remove the doubt regarding the position of music under the Copyright Act (1710) (Hunter 1986:279).

The second petition died an anonymous death in Parliamentary Committee, but the question posed within it was partially adressed in the decision of the first suit. When the initial court case finally came before Lord Chief Justice Mansfield, Mansfield was reported as saying in the decision that "there is no colour for saying that music is not within the Act." After the decision, on 16 June 1777, the Court stated officially that "Having heard counsel and considered this case, we are of the opinion, that a musical composition is a writing within the statute of the 8th of Queen Anne." (Hunter 1986:279)

The implications of these two decisions, *Becket v. Donaldson* and the Bach/Abel suit, are enormous. For the prose publishers, it meant that they could no longer depend on reprinting old classics in perpetuity, and would have to cultivate new works. Older works would cease to be profitable for individual publishers once they entered the public domain at the expiry of the copyright. For music it meant that the composer (and also prose authors) were granted by the courts acknowledgement that a creative endeavor is an activity worthy of economic compensation. The finer points of the decision also clarified the process of gaining protection for works:

> The change from the protection of exceptions to general protection meant that publishers could no longer issue unauthorized editions with impunity. All publications gained copyright protection. Technically, registration [with the Stationers' Company] was not necessary to secure copyright. Though it may have been Parliament's intention in 1709-10 to require registration...[the] Chancery under Lord Hardwicke, strictly interpreted the clause on registration as pertaining only to proof of copyright (and the only admissible proof), thereby allowing the penalty to incur in the event of successful prosecution. (Hunter 1986:280)

---

[104] The support of common law right was affirmed in the courts as late as 1769 in *Millar v. Taylor* (Kase 1967:3).

Reviewing the registration entries at the Stationers' Company certainly eliminates any doubt as to composers' desire for protection of their works (music came to represent 25 percent of annual registrations - see Table 6).

Table 6

Number of music titles entered in Stationers' Company Registers:
1700-1799 (by decade); 1776-1790 (by year)
(Adapted from Hunter 1986:281)

Decade	No. of Titles	Year	No. of Titles
1700-09	0	1776	2
1710-19	39	1777	5
1720-29	22	1778	4
1730-39	16	1779	8
1740-49	7	1780	15
1750-59	13	1781	4
1760-69	43	1782	9
1770-79	35	1783	34
1780-89	738	1784	61
1790-99	1828	1785	68
		1786	105
		1787	173
		1788	130
		1789	139
		1790	87

Unfortunately for the composers, efforts were still required to change public opinion. On 2 March 1781, an anonymous public appeal was made in the *Morning Herald and Daily Advertiser* (Adapted from Humphries & Smith 1970:33):

> The Composers of music, in London, most respectfully acquaint the nobility and gentry, that henceforth their new music will be sold at their own dwelling houses; the reason for this is, because the music-shop keepers take so much advantage over the composers, viz. 1st when a set of music sells for 10s 6d the music shops take half a crown [2s 6d, or almost 25%] for their trouble of selling it. I think sixpence or a shilling profit [5-10%] is sufficient for a copy, as the only trouble is to sell it to the person that askes for it in the shop. - N.B. As it is customary with the booksellers. 2dly, the music-shop keepers take the seventh copy for their profit, which they call allowance; consequently there remains only 6s 3d out of the half a guinea to the composer for his performance, and he is obliged to pay the engraving, printing, paper and other expences. The composers of music will refer to the impartial judgement of a generous public, if it is just, that when a good composition appears, and is accepted by the public, that the music-shop keepers, take the money, and for the composer remains only the honour, by which he is to live. Consequently the shop keepers live by the sweat and labour of the composers, and are, into the bargain, very insolent and impertinent towards them.

This quotation offers an example of many issues discussed to this point. Firstly, the nature of the 'public' at which the appeal is directed is clearly those with money to spend. It is also suggestive of an existing pattern of purchasing printed music among the middle and upper classes. Secondly, it points to the changing relationship between composer and publisher. Previous descriptions suggest that the printer/publisher would purchase the manuscript from the composer, and in so doing, assume the risk of the initial investment of paper, ink and the associated labour. By the 1780s this pattern appears to have changed to one of forcing the composer to assume the initial economic risk for a very limited return. This would allow publishers a virtual guarantee of greatly increased profits, given the necessity for composers to produce printed works as part of their income.

The plea clearly illustrates the changing attitude toward the nature of the composers' labour in the creation of a piece of music. Shop-keepers living by the 'sweat and labour' of the workers is perfectly descriptive of capitalist productive relationships as outlined by Marx. There is also a very clear plea to accept the labour of the composer as the element of the printed work that deserves remuneration, not the efforts of shop-keepers. In effect, the composers are trying to cut out the middleman in the transaction, using the value of their labour as the focal point for the appeal. The wider implications of some of these points will be discussed further in chapter four.

3.3.4 Music Dissemination

Notated music (usually copied, but sometimes machine printed) first started travelling consistently in the Middle Ages between the monasteries and the religious orders throughout Europe, continuing into the sixteenth century. The transmission of written music in this fashion was paralleled by the correspondence between heads of state and court messengers, though the Church played the dominant role until the Reformation and the beginnings of the religious strife of the time. Into the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries private travels, concurrent with the development of print culture in Italy and France, fostered the collection of music abroad (Fenlon 1987). This was particularly true when the fashion of the time was to send the eldest son on the 'Grand Tour' of Europe as part of his eductaion. Such collection inevitably led to commerce: by the mid-sixteenth century, "buying and selling music and theoretical works had become...a considerable enterprise conducted on a European basis" (Fenlon 1987:16).

As already discussed, the printing and publishing industries began to flourish in the latter seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Increases in commercial activity of all kinds, particularly book printing and selling, provided a ready-made outlet for the sale of music. Printed music then followed along the established commercial trade routes into the countryside via the growing network of commissioned merchants

(Brook 1975:15). Improved roads and transportation systems[105] allowed those not in London to have access to the current cultural developments, not to mention the landed gentry who made regular trips to London and returned to their estates with the latest music.

The shift in patronage from the aristocracy to the middle classes after the Restoration also affected music dissemination. Firstly, and perhaps most obviously, was the opening of a new segment of the population that was flexing its economic muscle for the first time. The middle classes, by a combination of circumstance and desire, financed much of the expansion of music dissemination through direct interest in music (and leisure) (Ehrlich 1976:194). National and international trade networks also played a role. Such trade increased potential contact with music in other countries either through business-related travel or through contact with agents and booksellers. Brook (1975:15) makes the point that the "existence of a large music-hungry middle class with a passion for the latest in sonatas, quartets and, especially operatic airs, helped create a substantial music publishing trade."[106]

These factors all played signficant roles in the publishing boom of the early eighteenth century. However, there were some important consequences from this burst of activity. Profitable public performance and the sale of printed compositions marked the emancipation of the musician, and the music, from traditional patronage relations (Weber 1989). This was followed by a subsequent shift to a strictly economic, middle class 'patronage' which left the musician with many more income options, though with more risk[107]. Supicic (1985:253) suggests that the development of publishing and dissemination led to

> greater freedom for the composer, a larger public, the economic stimulus from publishing, engraving, and printing...[as well as] further dissemination and broadening of the public,... a great stimulus toward musical amateurism, and, finally, stronger incentives for commercial activites that were themselves connected with music and musical life.

The dissemination of printed music throughout Europe generated something of a new phenomenon in music: publicity. The arrival and acceptance of printed works prior to the arrival of the composer boosted interest and attendance of performances (and presumeably music sales would also increase - the early publicity tour). As one example among many, Wyn Jones (1983:156) asserts that, "The origins of Haydn's later fame can be most legitimately traced to the two-year period 1771-1772 when ten publications of his music became available." It would be naive to think that such publicity was accidental. As Ehrlich (1989:3) observes of the growing number of impresarios,

---

[105] Colley (1986:102) reports that by the early part of the nineteenth century, the turnpike system in Britain covered almost 25 000 miles.

[106] Weber (1977:10-11) notes that "The subscription systems could not handle large quantities of music and was displaced by full-time music sellers....The person-to-person distribution system thus gave way to a professionalized trade network." In London there were 12 music sellers in 1750, 30 in 1794 and 150 in 1824.

[107] Young (1980:619) notes that "the more prosperous citizens of the main commercial towns became increasingly effective dispensers of patronage and, as music was published in ever greater quantities to supply a growing market, its availability stimulated demand still further."

> In addition to seeking out finance and talent, and packaging performances, these entrepreneurs began to develop elementary methods of preparing and conditioning audiences with crude tools of publicity: handbills, 'planted' newspaper stories, snobbish association and the like; tools which would eventually be transformed into monstrous engines for the manipulation of taste.

Chapter 4
Analysis

There are several components to the production of music in London between 1660 and the late eighteenth century. This section will endeavor to describe some of the more important social and material relations necessary for such events to take place. The sections following will be loosely separated between live performance and the creation of the written work as it has manifest itself in this historical period. Organization will follow the outline of the historical materialist model. The material and social relations of production will serve as the foundation for ordering the analysis of the data. Elements of ideology will be added where appropriate.

Implicit within capitalism is the inequity in the social roles of the members involved in production relations. This is a result of inequity of the ownership of private property on which capitalist relations, and indeed, capital itself, depends. Differential ownership is then translated into a corresponding inequity in the appropriation of the profits of productive relations. The labourer thus has virtually no power in relation to the capitalist because of the inequity in the ownership of resources used in production (Marx 1960, 1938). The wage-labourer is dependent on the much greater resources of the capitalist, and consequently on the expanded networks necessary to support the capitalist's resources. In the absence of these expanding, and ultimately all-inclusive social and material networks, the value of the worker's labour cannot be realized, regardless of the nature of that labour. An examination of the conditions of music performance provides a good example of such inequities.

4.1 Performance Culture

There were many parameters placed on the public performance of music at this time. The most obvious is the delineation of space and the control of the environment in which music is performed. In order for an admission to be charged for the consumption of music, there must be a clear differentiation between those who have paid and those who have not. The existence of such demarcation has not only many important consequences, but is in fact reflective of the capitalist mode of production itself.

The presence of clearly defined and understood boundaries is most certainly not a result of capitalism - there always exist physical and social boundaries of some kind. With changing social relationships and a new emphasis on a monetary economy, no longer could the extra-economic aspects of feudal society (social and religious proscriptions) be depended upon to maintain the social hierarchy. However, the economic organization of capitalism provides for the first time a new means of negotiating existing boundaries through economic means (Hilton 1976). Therefore, money, in the form of admission, becomes the easiest way to regulate access to space or events.

The demand of admission to a performance is an affirmation of the existence of private property. In musical life, there are many types of property. In particular, the musicians (the vast majority of performances took place with more than one musician, either together or sequentially) are the owners of their means of production: the skills and knowledge of music to which admission controls access. The musicians' tools are also included as means of production, but the assertion of ownership is much less apparent.

To the audience, differences in ownership of the instruments of production are inconsequential. Admission has served to allow consumption of the labour of the musician - the means of creating that product are of no importance. However, to the musician, it is an important distinction. Variation in ownership of the musical tools affects both production of the music and the allocation of admission collected in exchange for that music. If the musician owns the tool (instrument) on and through which labour is being expended, then the value of the product (music) must exceed the value of both the labour expended by the musician in production, as well as the amount of value lost from the instrument being used in both immediate (strings, reeds) and long-term value (wear to pegs, bows, fingerboards for stringed instruments). However, it is reasonable to suppose that the musician, in using a very familiar tool, can produce a superior product to that produced by an unfamiliar instrument[108].

If the musician does not own, or is not performing, on his own instrument, (for example the organ at Thomas Britton's music club), then a portion of income must go to the owner of the tool of production to support the maintenance and any inconvenience incurred by the instruments' use. Furthermore, the quality of the product can be drastically affected by the quality of the instrument, in turn affecting the value of the product. This places the musician into a position of mutual dependence with the owner of the instrument. The value of the product cannot be realized without instruments, but the value of the labour in the instrument cannot be realized (at least in part) until music is produced on it[109]. The sale of the instrument would also realize its value; however, in either case its value is based on its social utility - namely the quality that it imparts to the musical product itself.

---

[108] There is a very definite hierarchy in the quality of instruments and their subsequent value. If a performer owns their own high quality tool, the realization of the product (music) will also be of a higher quality than would a product created by a lower quality instrument. The relationship between the ability of the performer, instrument quality, and quality of musical product will not be discussed any further, except to state the assumption that the higher quality the instrument, the higher its cost, the better the quality of the product, and the less likely the instrument is to be rented or loaned to a different producer.

Property ownership becomes even more apparent on the larger scale of performance organization. As was seen in the development of the public concert, public-houses played an important role as venues for musicians to realize the value of their labour. There is an interesting distinction that takes place in the form of payment at this stage of the development of concerts. Loosely split, the distinction would be between direct and indirect admission to the establishment for the consumption of music.

The direct form of admission was outlined earlier - those persons who desire to consume music for a given period of time pay a specified admission for the privilege of doing so. In contrast, an indirect admission exists where it is unclear for which privileges the admission is being paid. This would be the case for a general admission charge to enter the establishment irrespective of the presence of entertainment in any form. If the keeper of a public-house provides music for patrons, but does not charge an admission, then the value of the musician's labour must be realized in different ways. The first is simply that the person in charge of the establishment pays an agreed amount to the musician(s) for specified services. The keeper then recoups that payment through profits gained by (hopefully) increasing the attendance or increasing consumption by the existing patrons.

The final type of payment would be direct, but voluntary, due to the lack of restriction placed on the act of payment itself. The patron would give a sum of money to the performer either before or after the musician played as the patron saw fit. The keeper would thus not have to pay the musician, but could nonetheless receive the benefits of this arrangement through greater sales. This type of payment clearly could exist outside of public-houses due to its immediacy. However, both the Elizabethan Act of 1572 and the edict by Cromwell's Parliament effectively banned such minstrels from the streets, forcing them to more a protected environment. This placed the public-houses in a very powerful position to demand services from musicians unemployed by the Civil War. Musicians had to contend not only with prosecution as itinerant minstrels, but also the rise in the number of unemployed musicians attempting to find work.

---

[109] It is precisely this relationship between tool and producer that contradicts Cohen's (1978) notion that only material relations can exist as forces of production. It is essential to have both material and social relations interacting, as neither can be defined as a force or relation of production in the absence of the other.

The conditions of public performance changed quite dramatically between the Restoration and the end of the seventeenth century. The most prominent difference was the increasingly dedicated use of rooms to the presentation of musical performances. It is not unimportant that the date of first reference to music in public-houses pre-dated the establishment of regular concerts at Britton's Music Club by only two decades. The rapidity with which an audience could be found to support a more organized endeavor is astounding. However, there are a number of influences that played an important role in the establishment of the particular constellation of relationships necessary to present such musical enterprises.

In the construction of a musical event, performer and audience are inseparable from the definition of the event itself. Therefore, it is reasonable to suppose that there were productive and consumptive relationships already established which could be easily modified to include music as the product. This appears to be the case. The productive relations of the musicians at this time have been discussed briefly already. However, the combination of unemployed musicians, an upper class reluctant to continue traditional patronage relations[110], and the multifaceted growth of the socioeconomic base of London itself, left a group of musicians extremely receptive to any possibility of economic gain. Using the patterns developed in pre-Restoration theatres, a well as the example of opera abroad (Grout 1988), it is not a large step to suggest the devotion of a space for the sole consumption of music. In other words, to formalize the relations surrounding the event in order to present it as a new activity to the public.

For the public's part, the payment of admission to a musical performance was essentially the same as the consumptive relations developed around the theatres a century earlier. It is even more suggestive that primarily the upper-middle and upper classes maintained theatrical performances until the theatre closures by the Puritans . There would have been an audience conditioned to expect a certain type of relationship to exist to produce a theatrical performance. Presenting music in the same format was only a small shift in terms of establishing the same productive relations. The difficult part was the slow acceptance of instrumental music by the public as the object of consumption.

---

[110] The extent to which patronage relations represented those of the Continent or those described in the discussion of theatre patronage is unclear. Likely it was a combination of both.

The transition to supported public concerts as they appeared by the turn of the century was affected through two channels. The first was the increasing use of music in conjunction with either opera or musical theatre in various forms. The motivation for increasing the amount of music in dramatic performances may have been purely pragmatic to avoid censorship (recall D'Avenant's *The Siege of Rhodes* (Grout 1988:155)). Regardless of intent, the net result was a greater amount, and thus familiarity and interest, in the instrumental component of the performance.

The second channel was through the increasingly regular concerts that began to take place among the public and the private rooms in London. The most notable of these were by Banister and Britton. The fact that Banister survived a number of location changes, while Britton kept his series going for almost four decades demonstrates the interest among the musically inclined for this type of event.

Of course, for several years since its inception, Britton's concerts were free. However, the influence these concerts had on later efforts was likely immense. The concert attracted regular attendance by a large number of the aristocracy, upper class, and the middling classes, in addition to most of the prominent musicians of the time. The success of the concerts undoubtedly provided a template for both the performance practice of such events by the musicians, and the consumption practices established among the leisure classes. Concert attendance provided a very nice compromise between the social value of being seen as a patron of the arts, without the expense of actually retaining musicians. It also provided an alternative to the more expensive and socially rigorous attendance of opera. It would also be naive to suppose that there was not also a real interest and desire among members of the audience to appreciate the music that was being presented.

For organizers of these events to maximize the profits, larger venues were needed. However, these venues, like the public-houses, were almost never controlled by musicians themselves. The capital expenditure to establish such venues was beyond the means of most musicians. Therefore, rent, size and thus ticket price became increasingly important considerations before a performance could even take place. Availability in particular was problematic as there were few large rooms in existence suitable for performance. The use of opera theatres was a poor option at best due to the licensing restrictions. The appropriation of existing rooms was thus a more economically feasible arrangement - if the concerts failed, the room could return to its original purpose (Hickford's Room in particular followed this arrangement). The risk of creating a room specifically for music was substantially high to delay its occurrence until well into the eighteenth century (for example, the Music Room in Oxford, 1748).

The corollary of this expansion was that performance was becoming more removed from the conditions of its consumption. There was not only an increasing physical separation between the performer and the audience as venue size increases, but there was a corresponding loss of direct influence by the consumer on the product that was produced. The type of concert given by Banister was becoming less and less possible (pay an admission and 'call for what you pleased').

Concurrent with this growing separation of the consumer from the producer was the growth in the complexity of the material and social relationships required to produce the end product. Beyond simply procuring the hall and putting out advertising, important material considerations had to be taken into account. Larger halls need more sound to transmit the product of the musicians labour to the paying consumer. The first option was to use larger numbers of musicians. This could be done simply by doubling the parts, thereby increasing the volume of the piece.

However, the artistic component of the relationship took advantage of increasing instrumental resources. Pieces for larger and larger collections of instruments were being written to be performed in these larger halls. An example of this can be seen in the work of G. F. Handel (1685-1759). Geiringer (1978:123) points out that "in his Italian opera written for British audiences [Handel] had to limit the size of his orchestra on account of the smallness of the orchestra pits in London [opera] theatres...He was in a better position when he performed oratorios on the concert stage." The quote also indicates that composers and performers had full knowledge of the separation between the opera theatres in London and the concert rooms that were becoming increasingly popular[111].

The second response to the larger venues was a reconsideration of musical instruments to more effectively produce sound. The most notable example of this is the change in violins that began to occur in the early part of the eighteenth century. Among the most highly regarded lines of violin makers of the seventeenth century was the Amati family of Cremona, ending with Nicola Amati (1596-1684). Though the beauty of their sound was deemed perfect at the time, changing venues placed increasing demands on the volume (and quality) of the instrument[112]. Amati's student, Antonio Stradivari (1644-1737) produced a model that was larger and flatter than the Amati. Though it, too, produced a beautiful tone, the larger size and longer neck (requiring higher string tension), produced much greater volume and tone than did the Amati (Geiringer 1978; Forsyth 1985).

---

[111] Forsyth (1985:35) notes that Haydn's London symphonies (Nos. 93-101) were written specially for performance at the Hanover Square Rooms.

[112] The requirements of the musicians had to be reflected in the instruments generally, as instrument-makers also had to respond to market demands. However, the corollary to this is that as the quality of the instruments increased, so too did the compositions to explore the possibilities of the new instruments. For example the first

4.2 Print Culture

The manifestation of the new capitalist culture developing in London can be shown by the growth of the printing and publishing of music. Like the material and social relationships involved in the production of music performance, the relationships of the printing and publishing business grew at a tremendous rate after the Restoration. Though the print industry and composing for performance held mutually influential roles prior to 1700, the print industry was mostly subordinate to performance. A small branch of the print industry focused on tutor books and educational materials that were basically independent of performance life[113]. However, the sale of popular tunes and airs of the time depended first on their popularity in performance to ensure success in sales.

Many of the relations that developed after the establishment of a profitable publishing industry were discussed earlier. However, three important features of the printed work became apparent that eventually led to the relative autonomy of publishing from performance: durability, dissemination and repertory. The durability of printed music allowed a piece of music to exist beyond the termination of the performance. Increased exposure and access to a piece of music allowed publishers, performers and collectors to expand their ability to collect music within or across genres[114].

Publishing also provided a means to obtain a permanent copy of a piece of music in a mass produced form for the first time[115]. The desire for a consuming public to hear a piece of music and then to literally be able to take it home, held a great deal of promise for the industry. Interestingly, the purchaser still had to be able

---

written violin solos were composed in the mid-seventeenth century by Biago Marini (d. 1660), just at the time when the superior quality instruments of the Cremona families (Amati: 1592-1684; Guarneri: 1630-1695; and Stradivari: 1644-1737) were becoming known (Schlesinger 1969).

[113] For an example, see Poulin (1990).

[114] By implication, such exposure would also bring access to music of other cultures. However, the very strong Western emphasis on notated music was not shared by many non-Western cultures. Therefore, most non-Western musics available in print at the time would likely have been transcribed into Western notation and thus questionable in the accurate reflection of a culture's musical heritage.

[115] Though there also existed large numbers of written manuscripts, this was the first time when there were no practical limits to the number of copies produced, though there were of course market limitations.

to realize the written form to enjoy the piece. However, with increasing leisure time and interest in music, music lessons were also becoming a popular middle and upper class pastime[116] .

The second advantage of printed music over performance was the physical distance the printed piece could travel. There was definitely a much wider 'audience' available for the printed work than the performance. This expansion was not only horizontal into national and international markets. It also occurred vertically, by presenting copies at prices less than the cost of concert admission[117]. The printed work was now able to reach an audience before the audience came to the performance; a condition which would begin to have substantial consequences later in the century.

Finally, virtually any type of music could be published by the same person or company. The performance world was substantially segregated between the opera, instrumental and vocal concerts, and the assorted forms that found life in the streets or the public-houses[118]. While there was some overlap on the part of the musicians between the opera orchestra and various concert performances, it was likely less common to have audiences split attendance equally between the two. The fact that there were restrictions on the number of opera theatres itself suggests that there was not a large enough audience base to support open competition. There were, however, a number of concerts performed at any given time. Of course, the cost to stage an opera and the capital expenses involved in the opulent theatres was undoubtedly reflected in the admission, leaving opera to only a very small, affluent segment of society.

The net result of these factors was the substantial reorganization of several aspects of the publishing industry itself and of the relationships between composers, performers, and publishers. For the publishers, these changing conditions meant profit. Growing commercial networks, increasing expendable income, and the growing interest in and social necessity of music education meant a greater market for printed music. It also meant the development of specialization: the choice to print music exclusively, and the choice of what type of music was most profitable to print (see previous discussion of Walsh). Publishers were also using advertising, having the additional edge of being able to publish their own in the form of catalogues or within editions[119].

---

[116] Both Brook (1975) and Tilmouth (1957) mention the increasing revenue gained by musicians through private teaching.

[117] One penny to two pence for broadsheets (Hyde 1985:107). Song sheets were more sophisticated musically and were one of the most popular forms of printed music in the early eighteenth century (Krummel 1975).

[118] Popular or folk would be inappropriate here. They range from music by the very poor to collections of catches and glees by exclusive, aristocratic gentlemen's clubs.

Specialization also implies a greater control over the production process to produce a particular item. Though little of it is known, it would also seem likely that publishers after Walsh (and perhaps later by Walsh as well) would either own their own presses, or have fairly exclusive contracts with individual printers. Such intimate ties with printers would likely result in closer correspondence with the power of the Stationers' Company.

Expansion in the publishing industry goes a long way in explaining the political and subsequently legal influence of the publishers. The chain of influence into Parliament through the Stationers' Company is easy to follow. It would not have been difficult for the publisher's influence to quash appeals by composers for an increasing share of the profits. The result, until the settlement of the intent of the 1710 Copyright Act in the 1770s, was the continued exploitation of the composers under the increasingly powerful publishing companies.

The one-time sale of compositions to publishers constituted a complete transfer of ownership to the publisher of the work. Close ties between publishers and the Stationers' Company also made it difficult for composers to start their own publishing companies. Finally, and more importantly on the conceptual level, the composer lost control of the work, both legally and practically. No longer could the composer oversee every performance of a given work. It was now possible, through mass copies, for performances of the same piece to occur in several locations at the same time.

This had a two-fold effect. First, it began to put musicians at an increasing disadvantage to publishers because they now had to buy the compositions that were becoming well-known and popular to attract an audience to performances. Secondly, widespread publication completed what increasing venue size began: the emancipation of the composition from the composer. The performer could now respond quickly to the desires of the audience by simply purchasing the latest popular printed scores, compared to scores copied by hand. While it continued to be relatively common for composers to perform their own pieces, it also became increasingly common for audiences to expect to hear excerpts from the latest opera with other pieces from the Continent in the same program - the same pieces they were buying from the growing selection of music editions becoming available.

---

[119] Musicians also began to advertise more frequently by the late seventeenth century, especially with the growth of the number of newspapers in London after the lapsing of the Printing Act in 1695. Consequently it also became an increasing business expense levied against the musicians.

4.3 Value

While labour is the essential element of the Marx's theory of value, value itself can only be realized through social exchange relations. This is particularly true of non-subsistence items where immediate social utility is much less constrained by the physical properties of the object. Music in performance is perhaps the extreme example of this type. Leaving aside whether music is truly a commodity, the fact of its demand and consumption leaves no question to its social utility. However, in the most literal sense, it does not have the physical properties that would characterize most commodities. As a result, the construction of the criteria for value become exceptionally fluid.

The nature of the relationships between consumer and producer and between consumers and object were suggested by Marx (1973:92):

> The need which consumption feels for the object is created by the perception of it. The object of art - like every other product - creates a public which is sensitive to art and enjoys beauty. Production thus not only creates an object for the subject, but also a subject for the object...[production] thus produces the object of consumption, the manner of consumption and the motive of consumption. Consumption likewise produces the producer's *inclination* by beckoning him as an aim-determining need.

The changing nature of consumer society after the Restoration did indeed appear to reflect the relationships as suggested by Marx. Though some components of middle and upper class social life have been discussed already, there are some other features which play an important part in creating a general social value for the consumption of music.

The growth of leisure and luxury consumption after the Restoration among all classes above a subsistence wage is beyond doubt (Borsay 1990; Lemire 1990; Cole 1981). There was, however, a split in the method of consumption between the classes. The upper classes simply had greater resources and greater power to implement those resources in order to fulfill their leisure aims. For example, Cunningham (1980) notes that in the eighteenth century there was a trend to the appropriation and privatization of previously public commons for the exclusive use of the wealthy. The result of this general trend was that "leisure became increasingly class-bound. The leisure class retreated to the home or to those fenced-off private enclosures where they might...listen to music, safe in the knowledge that they would meet only their own kind" (Cunningham 1980:76).

The privatization of these areas is simply an extension of the delineation of space necessary to regulate commodity exchange, as illustrated in the previous section. However, there was also an accompanying shift in social beliefs and values surrounding the consumption of leisure as a means of further delineating classes. In fact with rising personal incomes, wealth was no longer the sole privilege of the landed gentry and aristocracy. A contemporary observer lamented that, "In a wealthy mercantile nation there is nothing which can be bought for money, that will long continue to be an envied distinction" (in Leppert 1988:49).

It can be confidently asserted that one result of privatization was to force the lower classes out of the possibility of participating in music consumption with the middle and upper classes on a regular basis. The division between the middle and upper classes was significantly more blurred, however. After the Restoration the increasingly wealthy middle classes were beginning to challenge the financially pinched aristocracy who were attempting to recover from both domestic and international military conflicts. Wealth was no longer powerful enough on its own to demarcate the middle from the upper classes.

Class divisions were now being established, not with wealth itself, but the forms of wealth. Borsay (1982:9-10) summarizes this shift:

> Wealth was a prerequisite in the competition for status...[However], before money could carry status it had to be turned into personal possessions that were charged with social prestige. A whole pack of these material and psychological adornments was available... These were of an essentially cultural nature, for 'Culture' was the most prestigious attribute an aspiring gentleman could have. This and not the money he possessed, was what separated him from the social nether-world of the poor.

Borsay (1982:5) goes on to suggest that "culture embraced music, literature, drama, painting, interior decoration, gardening, dancing, and architecture."

The most important facet of the conversion of wealth into prestige is that it is done socially; that is, all of the attributes that Borsay lists as 'culture' are socially visible. Indeed, with the exception of perhaps drama (as theatre), none of the characteristics of 'culture' could be considered as explicitly social as the attendance of a public performance[120]. It must be admitted here that opera would likely be a better illustration of the social manifestations of public image (Weber 1989:303). However, opera was for the most part not a public event, insofar as admission was usually based on application and subscription.

As music was developing into the eighteenth century opinion was mixed regarding whether any social prestige or value could be gained by attendance. The religious establishment were clearly warning any who would pay heed to the dangers of music. In Congreve's *The Way of the World* (1700), the chaplain educating Lady Wishfort's daughter preached vigilance against, "such Debaucheries...as prophane Musick-meetings, where the lewd Trebles Squeek nothing but Bawdy, and the Basses roar Blasphemy" (Tilmouth 1957:20). The Reverend Bedford (c.1711) regarded theatres generally as 'so many synagogues of Satan' and noted that "there are many People, who go thither, as much to hear the Musick as to hear the Plays" (Tilmouth 1957:22).

---

[120] Smith (1989) suggests that it is exactly the public nature of the exchange which is essential for establishing and (re)negotiating value over time.

However, such warning were of little worth against the possibility of greater social standing. In an anonymous dialogue of 1693, 'Jovial' a jolly countryman, included "ogling...the Nymphs in the Boxes at Musick-meetings" among the common pursuits of the 'town beau', adding that many "go to the Play and the Musick-meeting out of meer Custom, not Desire" (Tilmouth 1957:20). Ehrlich (1976:198) suggests that while "Increased 'musicality' and education may also have contributed [to the growing popularity of public performance]...their influence was probably slight...Perhaps one should attribute more importance to snobbery and social emulation."[121]

It was becoming apparent by the early eighteenth century that appropriation of the prestige of attending musical performances was of increasing concern[122]. The general trend in the data toward larger and more luxurious concert rooms and the granting of Royal patents to concert organizations is illustrative of this trend. However, it cannot explain the moderately priced (compared to other entertainments, i.e. Ranelagh Gardens) concert series and subscriptions that predominated from the end of the seventeenth century to the mid-eighteenth century.

The most likely explanation for this phenomenon is two-fold. Firstly, similar to McCracken's hegemonic model of consumption, the upper classes were too slow in the full appropriation of instrumental music as an aristocratic cultural form to the exclusion of the middle classes. The strong traditions of private musical performances and opera enjoyed among the upper classes provided a buffer against any realization of changes in the social sphere of artistic consumption. The decreasing numbers and wealth of the aristocracy and the increasing expense of traditional forms of consumption left them to catch-up to the middle class entrepreneurs who were opening concert rooms, starting concert societies and attending concerts with increasing frequency.

---

[121] One theatre promoter suggested in the mid-eighteenth century that, "nothing can be more disagreeable, than for Persons of the first Quality, and those of the lowest Rank, to be seated in the same Bench together" (Cunningham 1980:16).

[122] Fischer (1963:50-51) makes the observation that "For the capitalist, luxury may mean the purely private satisfaction of his desires, but it also means the chance of displaying his wealth for prestige reasons."

Secondly, the growing force of the Englishtenment through the latter eighteenth century began to emphasize the scientific and the natural basis of knowledge over the religious and ideological. While the aristocracy and the church still had some influence over musical taste, it was increasingly the patrons who set the dictates of taste. Composed largely of members of the middle and upper-middle classes, they no longer felt compelled to look to an outside authority to validate musical taste, preferring instead to make their own decisions. The relationship between audience demands and performance content further emphasized the role the consuming public, as opposed to the dictates of the intelligentsia (Weber 1984; 1989:299).

In addition, the secular humanist movement, which appeared to be more quickly endorsed by the middle classes, helped move music more fully into its role as an amusement and entertainment. Once again, it ultimately fell to the consuming audience, not an intellectual elite, to determine the value of the music (Weber 1984). Both developments worked to middle class advantage. While many societies depended on upper class patronage for financial support and prestige value (see Royal Society of Musicians, for example), it was ultimately the musicians and audience demand (both of primarily middle class standing) that dictated the actual form and content of much of everyday musical life.

Therefore, with the exception of the exclusively aristocratic concert and opera societies (which are notable but not the majority), the everyday running of concerts after about 1700 fell to members of the middle or upper-middle classes. The owners and/or managers of venues, the inn- and tavern-keepers, instrument makers and a substantial segment of the regular audience all had an influence on the music that was composed and performed for the concerts.

4.4 Response to Marx

From the foundation of the work to this point, Marx's comments from the introduction can now be suitably addressed. Marx relies on two assumptions to support the premise that most artistic relations lie outside of the capitalist mode of production. The first assumption states that the formal subordination of a given labour process does not imply a change in the basis of the labour relations themselves. As Sayer (1987:32) summarizes,

> the fact is the capital subsumes the labour process as it finds it, that is to say, it takes over an *existing labour process*...there is no change as yet in the mode of production itself. *Technologically speaking*, the labour process goes on as before, with the proviso that it is now *subordinated* to capital.

The second assumption is implicit within the first. Marx relies on the assumption that the labour process, while maintaining its fundamental form of production, is not repositioned with regard to the system of relationships within which the labour process takes place. Specifically, Marx appears to suggest that because capital and labour are contained within the same person, it does not match the predominant characterization of relations in the capitalist mode of production, and is thus excluded from it:

> The means of production become capital only in so far as they have become separated from labourer and confront labour as an independent power. But in the case referred to the producer - the labourer - is the possessor, the owner, of his means of production. They are therefore not capital, any more than in relation to them he is a wage-labourer. Nevertheless they are looked on as capital, and he himself is split in two, so that *he*, as capitalist, employs himself as wage-labourer. (Marx 1960:396)

Marx has identified the difficulty in examining such relations. Marx affirms his stance that until the means of production can be separated from labour the means of production cannot be considered capital. Nonetheless, he also identifies the mechanism by which his argument falls short. The nature of capitalist relations themselves create the fiction of capital in the owner/labourer which is then reified by the continued exchange of the products of labour in opposition to the capital of production. Marx's proposition does appear to hold true at the level of the performance event where the musician is simultaneously the owner of the means of production and wage-labourer. What Marx has failed to realize, however, is that the formalized relations of production *surrounding* the performance event are not of a different mode of production. In fact, the musician becomes a wage-labourer to those who control the capital necessary for such performances to take place.

Marx is, on one hand, absolutely correct in so far as music is created in exactly the same way in feudal, slave, or capitalist modes of production. Instruments are played to created music in virtually the same way in all modes of production. Therefore, the technique of production is not altered in any significant way in the subsumption of the labour process under capital. However, Marx overlooks the reorientation of the material and social relations that must occur to support the continuation of the labour process.

Maintaining music performance in a capitalist mode of production demands that the musician(s) enter into other capitalist relations to support the economic conditions within which they exist as performers. In other words, it is no longer simply a personal exchange relationship between the musician and the consumer of labour as in a feudal relationship. The consumer is now supporting a series of capitalist relations between the instrument maker, owner of the venue, and any number of other 'capitalists' that are involved with a performance[123]. Soon after the Restoration, advertising became important, not to mention incidental expenses for clothing, transportation, accommodation (if traveling), and even candles for the hall[124].

The importance of the early concert organizations lies in gathering subscriptions and donations to offset some of these costs. The stabilization of the new formations of production was essential in maintaining regular performances. Very rarely could a musician undertake such a project in the absence of some kind of additional interaction within the constituting relations of capitalist production. In this regard, Marx could be accused of being overly hasty in his dismissal of the integral connection of the constituent relations within music performance and regular capitalist practice.

To the extent that music printing is included in Marx's statements in the introduction, the same argument applies to musicians that print and publish their own music. The materials involved (paper, typesets, presses, for example) must be produced through capitalist production. In the absence of such supplies the nature of the 'pre-capitalist' relations that constitute the subsumed labour would collapse. This only holds true for those musicians using typesets. With the full-scale adoption of engraving, the nature of the printing relations have clearly changed as a result of the productive (and consumptive) demands of capitalist society. The profit gained by printers and publishers distributing the work of separate composers is unquestionably capitalist production.

4.5 Music as Commodity

That Marx was incorrect in his characterization of the relations of production involved in music gives rise to questions regarding the status of the musical product as a commodity. Beginning with the easier of the two cases, there does not appear to be any question that printed copies of music are commodities according to Marx's definition. All forms of printed music exhibit both a material form (use-value) and an exchange value. However, the distribution of the value of the printed work seems to suggest a quirk in the application of Marx's definition.

The sale of a piece of music to a printer or publisher most commonly took the form of a one-time exchange. The value of the composer's labour has been realized wholly and completely in the single transaction. In the creation of the printed work, following Marx, it is the labour of the printer/publisher/retailer chain that is then realized on the sale of the printed work. If the composer was a wage-labourer under contract with the publisher, the relation would present itself as a solidly capitalist relationship. However, the absence of a contractual labour agreement between the composer and the printer suggests that none of the labour of the composer is realized in the creation of the printed work, only the labour of the printer/publisher expended in creating the work[125].

---

[123] A similar example where the productive activity remaining relatively unchanged, but the transition of the surrounding networks of production to capitalism alters the motivation behind, and reasoning of the process, can be seen in Murphy and Steward (1977).

[124] Though the first 'public' concerts did not occur in Germany until the 1750s, Moore (1987) gives a variety of examples of the same types of expenses that would have been encountered by musicians in England.

The same dilemma is apparent in the examination of the music as performance. On the surface, it appears as a commodity according to the definition. There is social utility of a variety of sorts satisfied in exchange for a given sum of money - both use-value and exchange-value exhibited. It is the immaterial form of the commodity that contradicts Marx definition of a 'material repository of value'. This would lead Marx to characterize the performance of music as a service, an instance where the product being purchased is the individual's labour, not the music created by the labour.

If a performer were creating music either learned aurally or reproduced from a printed work, the situation would represent that of the printer/publisher above. None of the labour remunerated as value would be that of the labour of the composer. Marx would likely agree with the view that in either case music is not represented as a commodity. He might further suggest that music is not a commodity in part due to the non-capitalist nature of the relationships that created it.

However, if one subscribes to the argument made here, that music is created and disseminated within capitalist relations of production, then what is the solution to the apparent dilemma? It lies in Marx's own conception of labour existing as abstract social labour. Marx contends that labour in its concrete form (as a particular manifestation of abstract labour) is necessary to create objects with value. The object must then enter into exchange relations with other objects for their value as commodities to be realized. To reproduce a particular object would require the same form of concrete labour to be expended for each identical object. Likewise, production of a different object would demand a different configuration of abstract labour as it is manifest in its concrete form.

Given these assumptions, it is fair to say that every commodity that is exchanged has associated with it a particular and unique pattern of labour. For different individuals to produce the same product, they would need to expend labour in the same particular pattern to create the object. The complexity of the pattern would thus correspond with the skill level required to realize the object in its material form.

---

[125] The exact parameters of this type of relationship are unclear - See Barker (1983).

The labour expended in the creation of music thus conforms to highly skilled, highly patterned labour as it manifests itself in concrete form. Each musical piece is characterized by a particular pattern of labour. The pattern itself can be executed to a higher or lower quality, depending on the quality of the labour of the producer. However, the execution of these patterns of labour to produce music are autonomous of the mode of production within which they take place. Inasmuch as the labour expended performing music could be considered a service would thus depend on the relation of the producer to the consumer, not the form of the product. Most importantly, however, it is dependent on the conception of the consumer regarding the form of the product being consumed (as stated by Marx at the beginning of section 4.3).

The question then ceases to be whether music is or is not a commodity, but rather, when music consumers alter their collective categorization of the productive relationship. There is clearly an alteration in the consumptive relations between feudalism and capitalism, for example. In the former, music was often a duty to be performed by a liveried servant; one duty among many. In capitalism, as has been demonstrated, music is performed in single quantifiable units (pieces) for definite periods of time (concerts), each of which has an exchange value and which carries no further obligations on either party in the exchange[126]. However, the particular technical means of production by which music is created has not changed.

If, as Marx suggests, producers and consumers are blind to the material and social relations of production in capital, then the materialist model would have us look to ideology to identify any changes in consumptive relations. One would expect changes in the ideological apprehension and treatment of music in accordance with the shift from a service relationship to a commodity production/consumption relationship. In fact, that is indeed where such evidence is found.

Through the long process discussed in chapter 3, the establishment of the Copyright Act (1710) was the beginning of the political and legal battles to legally validate the change in music production. The understanding and recognition of the existence of music as a sound object was thus clearly grounded well before the initiation of conflict that led to the Act. However, it was not until the printer and publishers began to profit from the composers' works that the conflict began. Composers and authors did not feel that their labour was being adequately compensated. The two sides of the Engravers' Act (1734/5) debate clearly illustrate this (Hunter 1987:135). It was felt that the artist,

---

[126] There may be other activities which are necessary for the performer to undertake, the success of which directly influences the economic reward. Most notable is the ability to sell the performance or the printed manuscript.

> has by his own Industry and Skill given his Print whatever Value it has above another common Piece of Paper; and therefore has a Right to all the Advantages arising from that superior Value, as a proper and adequate Return for his Industry and Skill.

Perhaps more telling is the comment of the copyists' activities:

> [The copyist] does not indeed steal the very Paper, (which if he did, tho' it is not of so great a Value, he knows he should suffer for it) but he steals from him [the artist] every Thing that made that Paper valuable, and reaps and Advantage which he has no more Right to than He, who counterfeits a Note of Hand, has to the Money he receives by it.

Not until *Becket v. Donaldson* was decided in 1774 and the Bach/Abel decision in 1777 was music and creative works in general granted autonomy as unique creative works; as manifestations of distinct patterns of labour *in their own right.* Thus, a music performance, as reflected in the law, was the reproduction (or production if the performer was the composer) of discrete commodities. Their existence, in the face of a contradiction to Marx's definition, must be decided on the basis of the perception of the consumer, not necessarily the form in which the product is consumed.

The same holds true for printed works as well. The music printed was now recognized as being the unique product of an individual; as existing outside of the printed work. Interestingly, while the written copy represents a concrete form of music, it is not until it is realized through the specific patterning of labour that it obtains its complete form. The printed form exists as something of a second-order reorientation of the labour of performance into a different pattern using different skills (skills that may be mutually exclusive to each other).

Chapter 5
Conclusion

There is little doubt that the task at hand has been accomplished. The position Marx takes regarding the production relations of the arts, particularly music, clearly demands some re-evaluation. However, there is one question that remains to be addressed: is such a criticism of Marx warranted on contextual grounds? If Marx was simply a victim of his circumstance, reflecting the beliefs and values of the time, then the goal of this work would have been substantially different. Therefore, it remains to be demonstrated that Marx was in a position to be aware of the changing concepts of property that in turn would have squarely challenged his notions of immaterial, or non-material products.

Though there are undoubtedly many other lines of argument to present such a position, what will be given here are examples from legal history. The choice of this line of argument is three-fold. Firstly, as legal evidence, there is little doubt that written records would have existed, and been available, for Marx to examine during his long stay in London. Secondly, during Marx's work on Capital (1938) in particular, legal judgments on the status of private property would presumably have been of central importance to his theoretical formulation of early capitalist society. The relatively long development of capitalism in London by the later nineteenth century would clearly have drawn Marx to investigate some of the legal doctrine and judgments of the time.

Finally, and most importantly, the legal system is by most accounts central to Marx's own notion of ideology. The manifestation and reflection of the state of the social and material relations of production in legal thought would certainly conform to Marx's materialist conception of history. The question is whether such changes were reflected in legal formulations of private property. Most importantly, did the legal judgments of the early nineteenth century clearly show manifest changes in the institutional conception of immaterial property?

An argument can be made for both sides of this question. However, the evidence overwhelmingly supports the contention of the main thesis of this work. Marx could have been aware of the both the actual nature of the capitalization process implicit in the subsumption of feudal relationships under capitalism, and also the legal existence of the notion of immaterial property. Knowing and understanding such information would certainly have forced Marx to re-evaluate his own position as stated in the introduction.

Examination of English contract law in the early nineteenth century, and even today, would unquestionably support Marx's contention that labour either produces a physical, material commodity, or is a commodity itself in the form of productive labour[127] or as a service. There is certainly no clear evidence that the thing exchanged in relations between capital and labour or consumer and producer would be conceived of anything but a physical object or labour itself.

The clearest evidence is in the definition of the executed or executory contract. This type of contract most closely represents the relationship between producer and consumer. The executed contract exists "where nothing remains to be done by either party, and where the transaction is completed at the moment the arrangement is made, as where an article is sold and delivered, and payment therefor is made on the spot." The executory contract simply places a temporal delay between payment and delivery of the product: "where some future act is done, as where an agreement is made to build a house in six months, or to do an act on or before a certain day, or to lend money upon a certain interest, payable at a future time" (Black 1979:292).

In the first instance, the labour is remunerated immediately on completion of the agreed task, or the deliverance of an agreed production; the latter delays deliverance of the agreed service or product. In both cases the product and the service expected as part of the fulfillment of the contract conforms fully with Marx's own notions of the productive relations between capital and labour (see also Kennedy 1979).

However, there are three lines of argument against Marx, each challenging the support of the argument above. The first relies on basic evidence from the statutes that would have been available during his stay in London. The second is based on a Gramscian formulation of class relations and ideology. Though not directly from Marx's work, the notions behind Gramsci's work would arguably have been apparent and understood by Marx, but perhaps not recognized for its importance. The final line of argument is based on a possible flaw in the model itself as it applies to immaterial commodities.

There were many statutes that were on the books and were likely, to some degree, common knowledge to those aware of English law. In addition to the statutes mentioned earlier in the work, other statutes were passed, included the later Engraving Copyright Act of 1766 (7 George III c.38), the general Copyright Act of 1775 (15 George III c.53) and the Prints Copyright Act of 1777 (17 George III c.57)

---

[127] Productive labour is used as Marx uses it: "labour which produces *surplus-value* for its employer, or which transforms the objective conditions of labour into capital..." (Marx 1960:384 - for a full discussion see pp. 380-384).

(Skone James 1971:xi). Such a run of copyright acts in the late eighteenth century is a good indicator, as well as clear legal exposition of the changing nature of rights in moveable and incorporeal property.

Though technically outside the scope of this work, there are, in fact, several other statutes passed after 1800 that lend further support to the arguement presented above. Between 1800 and 1850 four new copyright acts aimed specifically at particular types of artistic products were passed, along with the revision and renewal of the existing acts (adapted from Skone James 1971:xi):

Date	Name	Statute
1801	Copyright Act	41 George III c.107
1814	Sculpture Copyright Act	54 George III c.56
1833	Dramatic Copyright Act	3 & 4 William IV c.15
1835	Lectures Copyright Act	5 & 6 William IV c 65
1836	Prints Copyright Act	6 & 7 William IV c.59
1838	Dramatic Copyright Act	3 & 4 William IV c.15
1842	Literary Copyright Act	5 & 6 Victoria c.45
1844	International Copyright Act	7 & 8 Victoria c.12
1847	Colonial Copyright Act (Foreign Reprints Act)	10 & 11 Victoria c.95)

With so many different pieces of copyright legislation passed and on the books prior to Marx's work in London, it seems surprising that he had not investigated the possibility that the nature of property in a capitalist society was changing dramatically.

As perhaps more a point of interest than to add further weight to the argument, the statutes passed between 1850 and 1906 are even more demonstrative of the changing property concepts, particularly regarding music. It would certainly be even more conjectural to suppose Marx could have been aware of these later statutes (adapted from Skone James 1971:xi):

Date	Name	Statute
1852	International Copyright Act	15 & 16 Victoria c.12
1862	Fine Arts Copyright Act	25 & 26 Victoria c.68
1875	International Copyright Act	38 & 39 Victoria c.12
1882	Copyright (Musical Compositions) Act	45 & 46 Victoria c.40
1886	International Copyright Act	49 & 50 Victoria c.33
1888	Copyright (Musical Compositions) Act	51 & 52 Victoria c.17
1902	Musical (Summary Proceedings) Act	2 Edward VII c.15
1906	Musical Copyright Act	6 Edward VII c.36)

Where the argument presented above is something of an end result of several processes, the second argument illuminates the process itself. Not a great deal of detail will be presented here. However, before the position is presented, a summary of the hegemonic mechanism for the ruling class to maintain power through consent is worth noting. Boggs (in Greer 1982:305) stated that

> For hegemony to assert itself successfully in any society...it must operate in a dualistic manner: as a 'general conception of life' for the masses, and as a 'scholastic programme' or set of principles which is advanced by a sector of ... intellectual[s]...

If such a dualistic conception is in fact sound, which it appears to be, a couple of points are immediately evident. The first point follows from Marx's notion of ideology as organically related to the mode of production. The presence of the conception of property as a right versus property as a material object in the several legal statutes listed above would be clearly indicative of the acceptance of the concept by both the populace and the 'intellectual' segment of lawyers and scholars. The legal system is manifesting the changing (or changed) nature of both the ownership of private property as capital and the nature of the ownership and rights in the products of labour generally. Specifically, of course, is the notion that it became commonly accepted that the products of artistic relations have rights and those rights are considered as property in and of themselves, in the absence of a material object.

Taking this position on step further, it can be interpreted as a concession on the part of the aristocratic ruling class to the increasingly powerful middle classes. As mentioned earlier, the primary difference between the merchant classes and the aristocracy was the form of wealth. Merchant wealth existed primarily in moveable property, including stocks, bonds, credit notes and the like. In order to stabilize the foundation of their wealth, the holders of such moveable property needed legal assurances that in the event of conflict their rights of ownership in these properties would be upheld.

As the aristocracy also became increasingly involved in trading activities (see notes 11, 17 and 23 for examples) in the late eighteenth and nineteenth century, further pressure was placed to change legal concepts of property. As Blackstone (1978:384) wrote in the late eighteenth century of the transition to new forms of property:

> of later years, since the introduction and extensions of trade and commerce, which are entirely occupied in this species of property, and have greatly augmented its quantity and of course its value, we have learned to conceive different ideas of it.

The common law solution to property ownership is, for the most part, based on *de facto* possession; that is, "physical control or detention of a thing, as evidenced by some outward act" (Goldschmidt 1937:191). However, the new types of property demanded a new conceptual definition. A solution was found in the long history of the 'chose in action'[128].

The details of this development are beyond this discussion. Suffice it to indicate that there is little doubt that the growing number of acts passed to protect the notion of property rights was not simply to protect the works of artists. The nature of the growth of commerce and the economy demanded that such rights be present to protect the increasingly abstract forms of wealth that were being traded and accumulated throughout the world. As seen in miniature in the summary of the debates of the book lobby for the passing of the Copyright Act of 1710, so too the interests of the merchant elite were served by protecting moveable, incorporeal property rights versus immovable, corporeal property.

This work has, I believe, successfully demonstrated that most artistic relations of production are, in fact, fully integrated into and dependent upon broader capitalist relations. However, the puzzle of Marx's denial of immaterial objects as commodities is still problematic. The difficulty does not lie simply in the definition of commodity. The difficulty lies in Marx's incomplete application of the tenets of capitalist critique; in particular, the application of the concept of fetishism.

Referring to the summary of Marx's notion of fetishism in chapter 1, there are a number of clues that point to Marx's reliance on material over conceptual objects. The denial of Hegelian idealism is a good place to start. Marx put his theoretical eggs into the materialist basket at the expense of idealist notions of conceptual categories. He rejects the idealist tendency to create and reify abstract categories from a material reality. While he has good reason to take this position, such reification nonetheless occurs within his own model in the form of fetishism. Marx carries this stance into his discussion of the specific nature of commodities in capitalist society.

Implicit within the notion of exchange-value is the separation of the object for exchange, the producer, and the consumer. This removal of the object from the producer and consumer, and its interaction on the social field of exchange with other objects, characterizes the foundations of fetishism. Fetishism is complete once individuals begin to perceive these objects as being independent of their labour and of having an inherent value. Such fetishism also occurs with the alienation of the labour from the labourer. The labour has become a commodity to be exchanged, and as a result it too becomes fetishized.

---

[128] A chose (pronounced 'showz') in action is "an expression used to describe all personal rights of property which can only be claimed or enforced by action, and not by taking physical possession... The conception includes not only contractual rights, such as debts, claims for damages, but applies also to bills of exchange, promissory notes, shares, debentures, patents and copyrights" (Goldschmidt 1937:106).

Having theorized the alienation or fetishism of commodities, object and labour alike, Marx has provided a theoretical mechanism to explain the peculiar characteristics that commodities have in capitalism, particularly the exhibition of various forms of socially constructed value[129]. However, there is no means for Marx to theorize an immaterial commodity. A physical object clearly exists independent of the producer. The object is then fetishized, and appears to the consumer and producer to have inherent value. If, as Marx states, the value is in fact based on comparative amounts of abstract human labour, it is a logical step to suppose the labour that created the object has been alienated from the producer and is now manifest in the object.

In either case, the fetishized item necessitates the existence of a material form. However, the discussion of forms of property and the copyright laws to protect it suggest something beyond what Marx has apparently been able to theorize. It has clearly become a conceptual reality to consider products with no material form (though with conceptual or categorical form) as existing separate from producer and consumer. The existence of numerous statutes to protect rights of ownership of these products is strong evidence for the transformation.

Interestingly, Marx can account for the process by which individuals and society can create, or to use a more appropriate term, reify immaterial products within capitalism[130]. What Marx does not do is give an account of the characteristics of the product that is reified. The abstraction of the immaterial form, which has then been reified in popular consciousness and legal thought, does not fit into the definition of commodity given in chapter 1. Marx seems to have attempted to explain away such difficulties by arguing that the productive relations are outside of capitalist production, thus skirting the question of immaterial commodities entirely.

Therefore, Marx's materialist model generally, and the commodity theory specifically, does not seem able to account for live music as the product of a set of relations of production within capitalism. If this is so, then other models must be explored to find one that will place the sound object created in a musical performance on the same analytical ground as the 'material' form of music as printed score (and recorded media).

---

[129] At this point it would be of great interest to pursue Coover's (1989) work in regard to the earliest auctions devoted solely to music. The implications of the second-hand sale of sheet music, engraved plates, and instruments, are enormous in relation to the social construction of value, especially as it would impact the value of live performance. The connection between the beginnings of the sales (1846) and the changes perceptions of music would also be of great interest.

[130] For a contemporary account of a similar process, see Ollivier (1987).

It is perhaps appropriate at this point to make a comment or two in Marx's defence. Though the characteristics and results of artistic relations of production are clearly of importance to me, they do not appear to have been very important to Marx's agenda. His comments summarized in the introduction are actually placed in a subsection of an addenda in *Theories of Surplus Value* (1960). Furthermore, in comparison to other questions, the arts generally held a very small place in the overall corpus of Marx's work. Little could he have known the scope that music would eventually encompass in our modern world.

Taken in this light, this work may appear an overly zealous attact on a trivial point. However, the dogmatic acceptance of much of Marx's work has often forced excessively critical responses. In this work I set out to evaluate and critique a small part of Marx's work that could potentially be misinterpreted. Though it seems, at this stage, that there are difficulties in the application of Marx's model to one type of musical production, it is not to dismiss the model for other applications. In fact, I would hope that the discovery of such weaknesses would help to move the discipline into newer, more productive lines of inquiry.

There is no denying Marx has been a wellspring of inspiration and controversy in social analysis for over a century. He is no less so in this work. However, if Marx's work is to continue to provide a means to findings solutions to innumerable questions, the limitations must be as well defined as its strengths. I hope that this work has answered some questions, and in the process raised others, spurring other work that continues to test the limits.

References Cited

Althusser, L.
1992 "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses" (excerpt). A Critical and Cultural Theory Reader. A. Easthope and K. McGowan (Eds.). Toronto: University of Toronto Press. pp. 50-58.

Anderson P.
1983 In the Tracks of Historical Materialism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

1976 Considerations on Western Marxism. London: NLB.

Ashbee, A.
1981 Lists of Payments to the King's Musick in the Reign of Charles II (1660-1685). Kent: A. Ashbee.

Barber, W.J.
1975 British Economic Thought in India, 1600-1858. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Barker F. and Jackson, P.
1990 The History of London in Maps. London: Barrie and Jenkins.

Barker, M.
1983 "The Doctrines of Specification and Accession: Potential Bases for Legal Ownership through Labor?" Economic and Industrial Democracy. 4(1):1-17.

Baudrillard, J.
1990 Revenge of the Crystal. P. Foss and J. Pefanis (Eds. and Trans.). London: Pluto Press.

1975 The Mirror of Production. Telos Press.

Beckett, J.V.
1986 The Aristocracy in England, 1660-1914. London: Basil Blackwell.

Black, H.C.
1979 Black's Law Dictionary. Fifth Ed. St. Paul: West Publishing Co.

Blackstone, W.
1978 Commentaries on the Laws of England. Vol. II. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc. (Reprint of 1783 ed.)

Booth, G.D. and Kuhn, T.L.
1990 "Ecomonic and transmission factors as essential elements in the definition of folk, art, and pop music." The Musical Quarterly. 74(3):411-438.

Bourdieu, P.
1990 "Artistic taste and cultural capital." Culture and Society: Contemporary debates. J.C. Alexander and S. Seidman (Eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 205-215.

1977 Outline of a Theory of Practice. R. Nice (Trans.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Borsay, P.
1990 "Debate: The emergence of a leisure town: or an urban renaissance?" Past and Present. 126:189-196.

1982 "Culture, status, and the English urban landscape." History 67(219):1-12.

Bowker, R.R.
1912 Copyright: Its history and its law. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Bradford Young, J.
1985 "'The Great Abuse of Musick', 1711." Fontes Artis Musicae. 32(3):148-152

Brewer, J.
1980 "English Radicalism in the age of George III." Three British Revolutions: 1641, 1688, 1776. J.G.A. Pocock (Ed.) Princeton: Princeton University Press. pp.323-367.

Brook, B.S.
1975-6 "Piracy and panacea in the dissemination of music in the late eighteenth century." Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association. 102:12-36.

Bush, M.L.
1984 The English Aristocracy: A comparative synthesis. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Chrysander, F.
1877 "A sketch of the history of music printing, from the fifteenth to the nineteenth century." The Musical Times. 18:264-69; 324-27; 374-79; 470-75; 524-27; 584-87.

Clark, P.
1983 The English Alehouse: A social history, 1200-1830. London: Longman.

Cohen, G.A.
1983 "Forces and Relations of Production." Marx: A Hundred Years On. B. Matthews (Ed.). London: Lawrence and Wishart. pp. 111-134.

1978 Karl Marx's Theory of History. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Cole, W.A.
1981 "Factors in demand, 1700-80." Economic History of Britain Since 1700 (Vol. 1: 1700-1860). R. Floud and D. McCloskey (Eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 36-65.

Colley, L.
1986 "Whose nation? Class and national consciousness in Britain, 1750-1830." Past and Present. 113:97-117.

Coover, J.
1989 "Puttick's auctions: windows on the retail music trade." Journal of the Royal Musical Association. 114(1):56-68.

Corfield, P.J.
1990 "Walking the city streets: The urban odyssey in eighteenth-century Endland." Journal of Urban History. 16(2):132-174.

1987 "Class by name and number in eighteenth-century Britain." History 72(234):38-61

Corrigan, P. and Sayer, D.
1985 The Great Arch: English state formation as cultural revolution. London: Basil Blackwell.

Croft-Murray, E.
1980 "London: Pleasure gardens." New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians. S. Sadie (Ed.). 11:177-181.

Cunningham, H.
1980 Leisure in the Industrial Revolution, c.1780-1880. London: Croom Helm.

de Lafontaine, H. Cart
1909 The King's Musick: A transcript of records relating to music and musicians. London: Novello and Co. Ltd.

Drummond, P.
1978 "The Royal Society of Musicians in the eighteenth century." Music and Letters. 59(3):268-289.

Ehrenberg, R.
1928 Capital and Finance in the Age of the Renaissance. H.M. Lucas (Trans.). London: Jonathan Cape.

Ehrlich, C.
1989 "Market themes." Journal of the Royal Musical Association. 114(1):1-5.

1976-77 "Economic history and music." Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association. 103:188-199.

Elkin, R.
1955 The Old Concert Rooms of London. London: Edward Arnold, Inc.

Elphinstone, M.
1887 The Rise of the British Power in the East. E. Colebrooke (Ed.). London: John Murray.

Endell, F.
1968 Old Tavern Signs. Detroit: Singing Tree Press.

Engels, F.
1959 "Letters on historical materialism." Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels: Basic writings in politics and philosophy. L.S. Feuer (Ed.). New York: Anchor Books. pp. 395-412.

Epstein, M.
1968 The Early History of the Levant Company. New York: Augustus M. Kelley.

Everitt, A.
1966 "Social mobility in Early Modern England." Past and Present. 33:56-73.

Feather, J.
1987 "The publishers and the pirates: British copyright law in theory and practice, 1710-1775." Publishing History. 22:5-31.

1982 "The English book trade and the law, 1695-1799." Publishing History. 12:51-75.

1980 "The book trade in politics: The making of the Copyright Act of 1710." Publishing History. 8:19-44.

Fenlon, I.
1987 "Production and distribution of music in 16th- and 17th-century European society." Acta Musicologica. LIX(1):14-16.

Fischer, E.
1963 The Necessity of Art: A Marxist Approach. A. Bostock (Trans.) Hammondsworth: Penguin Books.

Forsyth, M.
1985 Buildings for Music. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Geiringer, K.
1978 Instruments in the History of Western Music. London: George Allen and Unwin.

Girouard, M.
1978 Life in the English Country House: A social and architectural history. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Golant, W.
1975 The Long Afternoon: British India, 1601-1947. London: Hamish Hamilton.

Goldschmidt, H.W.
1937 English Law from the Foreign Standpoint. London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, Ltd.

Gramsci, A.
1990 "Culture and ideological hegemony." Culture and Society: Contemporary debates. J.C. Alexander and S. Seidman (Eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 47-54.

Greer, E.
1982 "Antonio Gramsci and 'legal hegemony'." The Politics of Law: A progressive critique. D. Kairys (Ed.). New York: Pantheon Books.

Griffiths, P.
1965 The British Impact on India. Archon Books.

Grout, D.J.
1988 A Short History of Opera. Third Ed. New York: Columbia University Press.

Grout, D.J. and Palisca, C.V.
1988 A History of Western Music. Fourth Ed. New York: W.W. Norton and Co.

Hackwood, F.W.
1985 Inns, Ales, and Drinking Customs of Old England. London: Bracken Books.

Hannay, D.
1926 The Great Chartered Companies. London: Williams and Norgate, Ltd.

Harley, J.
1968 Music in Purcell's London: The social background. London: Dennis Dobson.

Hedges, S.A.
1978 "Dice music in the eighteenth century." Music and Letters. 59(2):180-187.

Hexter, J.H.
1950 "The education of the aristocracy in the Renaissance." Journal of Modern History. XXII(1):1-20.

Hilton, R. (Ed.)
1976 The Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism. London: NLB.

Holdworth, W.S.
1924 A History of English Law: Vol. 6. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd.

Humphries, C. and Smith, W.C.
1970 Music Publishing in the British Isles: From the beginning until the middle of the nineteenth century. Second edition with suppl. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hunter, D.
1990 "English country psalmodists and their publications, 1700-1760." Journal of the Royal Musical Association. 115(2):220-239.

1987 "Copyright protection for engravings and maps in eighteenth-century Britain." The Library, 6th Series. 9(2):128-147.

1986 "Music copyright in Britain to 1800." Music and Letters. 67(3):269-282.

Huq, M.
1964 The East India Company's Land Policy and Commerce in Bengal, 1698-1784.

Hyde, N.
1985 Four Faces of British Music. Worthing: Churchman Pub.

Izon, J.
1958 "Italian musicians at the Tudor court." Musical Quarterly. 44(3):329-337.

Jenkins, R.
1992 Pierre Bourdieu. London & New York: Routledge.

Jones, J.R.
1972 The Revolution of 1688 in England. New York: W.W. Norton and Co. Inc.

Kase, F.J.
1967 Copyright Thought in Continental Europe. New Jersey: F.B. Rothman and Co.

Kennedy, D.
1979 "The structure of Blackstone's Commentaries." Buffalo Law Review. 28(2):205-382.

Kidson, F.
1918 "John Playford, and 17th-century music publishing." Musical Quarterly. 4:516-534.

Krummel, D.W.
1975 English Music Printing, 1553-1700. London: The Bibliographical Society.

Larrain, J.
1986 A Reconstruction of Historical Materialism. London: Allen and Unwin.

Lee, R.D. and Shofield, R.S.
1981 "British population in the eighteenth century." Economic History of Britain since 1700. Vol. 1:1700-1860. R. Floud and D. McCloskey (Eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp.17-35.

Lemire, B.
1990 "Reflections on the character of consumerism, popular fashion and the English market in the eighteenth century." Material History Bulletin 31:65-70.

Leppert, R.
1988 Music and Image: Domesticity, ideology and socio-cultural formation in eighteenth-century England. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lindenberger, H.
1984 Opera: The Extravagant Art. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Margary, H.
1981 The A to Z of Georgian London. Kent: Lympne Castle.

Marx, K.
1973 Grundrisse. M. Niclaus (Trans.). London: Allen Lane.

1960 Theories of Surplus-Value: Volume IV of Capital. Part 1. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publication House.

1959 "Theses on Feuerbach." Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels: Basic writings in politics and philosophy. L.S. Feuer (Ed.). New York: Anchor Books. pp. 243-245.

1952 Theories of Surplus Value. Translated by G.A. Bonner and E. Burns. New York: International Publishers.

1947 The German Ideology: Parts I and III. R. Pascal (Ed.). New York: International Publishers.

1938 Capital: A Critical Analysis of Capitalist Production. F. Engels (Ed.) S. Moore and E. Aveling (Trans. from third German edition). George Allen and Unwin, Ltd.

Marx, K. and Engels, F.
1978 On Literature and Art. Moscow: Progress Publishers.

1947 Literature and Art (Selections from their writings). New York: International Press.

McCracken, G.
1990 "Textile history and the consumer epidemic: An anthropological approach to popular consumption and the mass market." Material History Bulletin. 31:59-63.

1988 Culture and Consumption: New approaches to the symbolic character of consumer goods and activities. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

McLennan G.
1983 "Historical Materialism Today: Some Variations and Problems." Marx: A Hundred Years On. B. Matthews (Ed.). London: Lawrence and Wishart. pp.135-159.

1981 Marxism and the Methodologies of History. London: NLB.

Mee, J.H.
1911 The Oldest Music Room in Europe: A record of eighteenth-century enterprise at Oxford. London: John Land.

Milhous, J. and Hume, R.D.
1986 "The Charter for the Royal Academy of Music." Music and Letters. 67(1):50-58.

Moore, J.V.
1987 Beethoven and Musical Economics. Ph.D. Diss. Ann Arbor: UMI (DA 87 21719).

Murphy, R.F. and Steward, J.H.
1977 "Tapper and Trappers: Parallel process in acculturation." Evolution and Ecology: Essays on social transformation. Jane Steward and R.F. Murphy (Eds.). Urbana: University of Illinois Press. pp. 151-179.

Neale, R.S.
1981 Class in English History, 1680-1850. Oxford: Basil Blackwell

Nettl, B.
1983 The Study of Ethnomusicology: Twenty-nine issues and concepts. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Nichol, D.W.
1990 "On the use of 'copy' and 'copyright': A Scriblerian coinage?" The Library. 6th Ser. 12(2):110-120.

Nicholls, D.
1985 "The English middle class and the ideological significance of Radicalism, 1760-1886." Journal of British Studies. 24:415-433.

Oates, M.I. and Baumol, W.J.
1972 "The economics of the theatre in renaissance London." Swedish Journal of Economics. 74(1):139-160.

Olmsted, T.
1993 "From performance to sales rack: Some notes on the commodification of contemporary music." Paper presented at the 23rd Popular Culture Association Conf., New Orleans, LA.

Pepys, S.
1985 The Shorter Pepys (Abridged version of Pepys Diaries). R. Latham (Ed.). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Pocock, J.G.A. (Ed.)
1980 "Introduction." Three English Revolutions: 1641, 1688, 1776. Princeton: Princeton University Press. pp. 3-22.

Poulin, P.L.
1990 "A view of eighteenth-century musical life and traning: Anton Stadler's 'Musick Plan'." Music and Letters. 71(2):215-224.

Price, C.
1989 "English Opera." History of Opera. S. Sadie (Ed.) London: Macmillan. pp. 38-46.

Rea, K.G.
1990 "Theatre, The history of Western," Encyclopedia Britannica. 28:531-554.

Richardson, A.E.
1934 The Old Inns of England. London: B.T. Batsford, Ltd.

Ronalds, F.S.
1937 The Attempted Whig Revolution of 1678-81. Urbana: University of Illinois.

Roscoe, C.
1968 "Haydn and London in the 1780's." Music and Letters. 49(3):203-212.

Rose, M.E.
1981 "Social changes and the industrial revolution." Economic History of Britain since 1700. Vol. 1:1700-1860. R. Floud and D. McCloskey (Eds.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp.253-275.

Sayer D.
1987 The Violence of Abstraction: The analytical foundations of historical materialism. London: Basil Blackwell.

Schlesinger, K.
1969 Instruments of the Modern Orchestra and Early Records of the Precursors of the Violin Family. London: William Reeves.

Schwarz, L.D.
1985 "The standard of living in the long run: London, 1700-1860." Economic History Review. 38(1):24-41

1982 "Social class and social geography: The middle classes in London at the end of the eighteenth century." Social History. 7(1):167-185.

Schwoerer, L.G.
1980 "The Bill of Rights: Epitome of the Revolution of 1688-89." Three English Revolutions: 1641, 1688, 1776. J.G.A. Pocock (Ed.) Princeton: Princeton University Press. pp. 224-243.

Scott, H.A.
1937 "London's first concert room." Music and Letters. 18(4):379-390.

1936 "London's earliest public concerts." Musical Quarterly. XXII:446-457.

Scott, J.
1982 The Upper Classes: Property and privilege in Britain. London: Macmillan.

Shaw, W.H.
1978 Marx's Theory of History. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Simmel, G.
1978 The Philosphy of Money. T. Bottomore and D. Frisby (Trans.). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Skone James, E.P.
1971 [Copinger and Skone James on] Copyright. Eleventh Ed. London: Sweet and Maxwell.

Smith, C.W.
1989 Auctions: The social construction of value. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Stone, L.
1984 An Open Elite? England 1540-1880. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

1980 "The results of the English Revolutions of the seventeenth century." Three English Revolutions: 1641, 1688, 1776. J.G.A. Pocock (Ed.) Princeton: Princeton University Press. pp. 23-108.

Supicic, I.
1985 "Early forms of musical "mass" culture." Music in the Classical Period: Essays in honor of Barry S. Brook. A.W. Atlas (Ed.). New York: Pendragon Press. pp. 249-257.

Taussig, M.T.
1980 The Devil and Commodity Fetishism in South America. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Temperley, N.
1980 "London: Religious institutions." New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians. S. Sadie (Ed.). 11:142-151.

Thirsk, J.
1990 "Popular consumption and the mass market in the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries." Material History Bulletin. 31:51-58.

Thomas, K.
1964 "Work and leisure in pre-industrial society." Past and Present. 29:50-66.

Tilmouth, M.
1957-8 "Some early London concerts and music clubs, 1670-1720." Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association. 84:13-26.

Veblen, T.
1934 The Theory of the Leisure Class. New York: Random House.

Walvin, J.
1984 English Urban Life, 1776-1851. London: Hutchinson.

Weber, W.
1989 "London: a city of unrivalled riches." The Classical Era. N. Zaslaw (Ed.). Englewood, NJ.: Prentice-Hall. pp. 293-326.

1989a "The 1784 Handel Commemoration as political ritual." Journal of British Studies. 28:43-69.

1984 "The contemporaneity of eighteenth-century musical taste." Musical Quarterly. 70(2):175-194.

1977 "Mass culture and the reshaping of European musical taste, 1770-1870." International Review of the Aesthetics and Sociology of Music. 8(1):5-22.

1975 Music and the Middle Class. London: Croom Helm.

Westrup, J.A.
1941 "Foreign musicians in Stuart England." Musical Quarterly. 27(1):70-89.

Wrigley, E.A.
1987 People, Cities and Wealth: The transformation of traditional society. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Wyn Jones, D.
1983 "Haydn's music in London in the period 1760-1790. Part One." The Haydn Yearbook. XIV:144-172.

Young, P.M.
1980 "Concert (ii)." New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians. S. Sadie (Ed.). 4:616-625.

1965 The Concert Tradition: From the Middle Ages to the twentieth century. New York: Roy Pub. Co.

Zelechow, B.
1991 "The Opera: The meeting of popular and elite culture in the nineteenth century." Journal of Popular Culture. 25(2):91-97.

Appendix 1

Composer privileges granted[131] 1710-1770
(Adapted from Hunter 1986:277n)

Date	Name
1720	Handel
1724	William Croft
1733	William Thompson
1739	Handel and Walsh
1741	T.A. Arne
1742	Maurice Green
1742 (?)	John Stanley
1744	Samuel Howard
1745	William Boyce
1749	Count de Saint Germain
1750	Niccolo Pasquali
1755	John Worgan[132]
1760	C.F. Abel
1760	Handel and Walsh
1763	J.C. Bach
1770 (?)	J.C. Fischer

---

[131] The eminence of the patentees and the brevity of the list illustrate the importance of court connections in obtaining royal patents.

[132] Published the Vauxhall Ballads (1755) from the Vauxhall pleasure gardens.

Appendix 2

Principal publishers active in England, 1560-1610.
Listed chronologically from date of initiation.
(Adapted from Humphries & Smith 1970:5)

Date	Name
1560-1589	Henry Denham
1566-1609	Thomas Este
1579-1601	John Wolfe
1584-1611	John Windet
1584-1628	Edward Allde
1587-1629	Humphrey Lownes (the elder)
1597-1638	William Stansby
1604-	The Stationers' Company
1609-1624	Thomas Snodham

Principal publishers active in Britain, 1746-1800.
Listed chronologically from date of initiation.
(Adapted from Humphries & Smith 1970:31)

Date	Name
1746-1798	Thompson
1750-present	Wheatstone
1754-1789	Bremner (London & Edinburgh)
1759-1805	Stewart (Edinburgh)
1762-1844	Fentum
1761-1780	Thorowgood and Horne; Thorowgood
1762-1824	William Forster (Sr. and Jr.)
1762-1785	Welcker
1766-1826	Straight and Skillern (& successors)
1767-1778	John Johnston
1767-1822	James Longman & Co.
1770-1786	Babb
1770-1780	Falkener
1772-1809	William Napier
1772-1815	James Johnson (Edinburgh)
1774-1834	Preston
1776-1795	John Bland
1779-1822	John Corri (London & Edinburgh)
1779-1803	Harrison & Co.; Harrison Cluse & Co.
1783-1823	Dale
1783-1824	Birchall and Beardmore
1784-1820	Anne Bland
1786-1834	Goulding
1787-1845	Monzani
1791-1829	Watlen (Edinburgh & London)
1795-1830	George Walker
1796-1844	Lavenu
1798-1810	Broderip and Wilkinson

Appendix 3

A illustrative list of editions with known prices.
(Compiled from Wyn Jones (1983); Humphries & Smith (1970); Kidson (1918))

Date	Title	Price	Publisher
Sixteenth Century			
1526	A Manual	2s/-; 1528 - 1s/8d; 1534 - 2s/-; 1554 - 4s/-	--
1526	A Processional	1s/8d; 1554 - 3s/-	--
1536	Book of Prick-song	3s/4d	--
1547	A Gradual	8s/4d; 1556 - 15s/-	--
1575	Scotch Psalms	2s/- (unbound) 3s/- (bound)	--
1597	Arte of Music (Morley)	4s/-	--
--	Lute Book	4s/-	--
--	Psalm Book 'with the notes'	8s/- and up	--
Seventeenth Century			
1685	A Choice Collection of 180 Loyal Songs	2s/-	--
1685	A Collection of Twenty Four Songs	1s/-	--
1694	The Songs to the New Play Don Quixote	2s/-	--
--	The Pleasant Companion or New Lessons and Instructions for the Flagelet (T. Greeting)	1s/-	J. Playford
--	Canticum sacra (R. Dering)	4 Vols. 3s/6d	J. Playford
--	The Treasury of Musick	3 Vols. in 1 Vol. 10s/-	J. Playford
--	The Musical Companion	2 Vols. in 1 Vol. 3s/6d	J. Playford```
--	Introduction to the Skill of Music	2s/-	J. Playford
--	The Dancing Master	2s/6d	J. Playford